The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

STRIKING developments in the war situation in the immediate future are so likely that the lot of one who has on September 7th to write comments to be read two or three weeks later is not enviable. Today the British and American Armies are established on the toe of Italy, having mastered Sicily since last we wrote; the Russians have already recovered two-thirds of the Donetz basin, and are moving forward on other sections of their long line; the U-boat campaign has been temporarily overcome in the Atlantic, and the Mediterranean is open to Allied shipping; and General MacArthur has opened an offensive in the S.W. Pacific. The Prime Minister remains on the other side of the Atlantic, the prolongation of his stay inclining people to believe that negotiations with the Italian government are proceeding; but speculation about this and about the findings of the Quebec Conference is speculation only.

Politically the most important development of the quarter has been the impression that the understanding between the Russian Government, on the one side, and the American and British, on the other, is imperfect. This has given hope to the Axis, for Germany's policy now is to hold out, inflicting as many losses as possible, while she embroils her antagonists with each other. The Russian demand for a Second Front—in Europe, in the West of Europe—is understandable in view of the weight of the Axis forces she has long contained, but we are sometimes tempted to wonder if all the talk about it is not bluff, that the Allied leaders understand each other perfectly well, have their plans set, and are merely deceiving the enemy by their pretended disagreements! One never knows in modern warfare, where propaganda plays so large a part! We can only repeat that it is the duty of all men of goodwill to labour earnestly to remove *any* cause of misunderstanding between the peoples of the four United Nations: those nations *must* stand together if there is to be hope of a peaceful world.

Meanwhile the extension of the fighting on land and the stepping-up of the air offensive are bringing sorrow into many homes as the cost is paid in more and more young lives. "Careless talk" should be avoided in this as in other connexions; easy references to "we only lost sixteen bombers" do not help those whose sons did not return.

* * *

It has been extremely difficult to learn the truth about the condition of religion in Russia under the Soviet regime. Prof. John Macmurray, whose article in our last issue aroused great interest, has for some time been Chairman of a Committee which has been endeavouring to gather information. Most students have been obliged to rely on the work of Dr. Julius Hecker and Dr. Matthew Spinka, even while they strove to reconcile the statements of Bolshevik sympathizers, on the one hand, and Orthodox *emigrés*, on the other. Two new works have recently come to our aid—Paul Miliukov's *Religion and the Church* (Oxford Press, 15s. 6d.), Part I of *Outlines of Russian Culture* (3 vols., 30s.), and Dr. N. S. Timasheff's *Religion in Soviet Russia* (Sheed, 6s.). Miliukov, who at one time played a prominent part in Russian politics, sought refuge in France; his Preface to this translation, made in America, is dated Christmas, 1940. The value of this sketch (there are slips on pp. 108 and 135 and some words not used in English, such as "deposal" for "deposition") is that it gives the background of Russian Church History, and regards sympathetically the various forms of "evangelical" and "spiritual" Christianity. Indeed, some scholar may be inspired by his outline to work out the comparison between English Nonconformity (including Quakerism) and that of Russia. Miliukov speaks of the "fundamental immobility" of the Eastern Church, "having no development" (the Metropolitan Seraphim). It need not justify the ways of God to man: "In proving its own cause", says Iury Samarin,

> the church oversteps its sphere and forfeits the possibility of presenting a correct definition. In the existence of the church lies its justification, and human reason with its questionings, doubts, and arguments should have no place in it. . . . It is quite superfluous for those members of the church who recognize its divine authority to prove the dogmas.

It was certain, therefore, that revolution would take the church unawares.

> The immobility of its dogma, the prevalence of administrative activities over spiritual, the ritualism of the masses and their indifference toward the spiritual contents of religion, placed the church in a totally different relation to revolutionary ideas from that which existed in 17th century England. . . .

Of all this there is no suggestion in Dr. Timasheff's book, which professes to be "a thoroughly documented report on conditions today", but leaves the reader with an impression, not only that the writer is biased, but that the Orthodox and Roman Churches alike have learnt nothing. Almost the only reference to the millions of Protestants in Dr. Timasheff's pages is a note to say that

> some extreme groups evolved beliefs and rites which would have been suppressed in any country. It is noteworthy that

the *Dukhobory*, after their emigration to the new world, caused much trouble.

Nevertheless, the account of the violent attacks on religion in 1922-23, 1929-30, and 1937-38, with the sundry changes in administration, if not in declared policy, is of value. Dr. Timasheff is probably right in concluding that the present "let-up" results from expediency rather than principle, though no doubt Prof. Macmurray's conclusion is correct—

> A Church which inculcates submission to the powers that be, and discourages revolutionary tendencies, may not be so unwelcome in a Socialist society which has been firmly established, as it was to the band of revolutionaries who had to struggle with the forces of the old order.

The Russian writer also clearly brings out the failure of the "militant godless". Would that we had found him advocating real spiritual religion rather than a return to the state Miliukov describes!

* * *

THAT Christian gentleman and Defender of the Faith, General Franco, promised that there should be religious liberty when he ruled Spain. His supporters in this country loudly acclaimed the toleration he, and the Duke of Alba on his behalf, guaranteed. We do not learn much of Spain today, but there is no evidence of any attempt to implement this promise. Protestant places of worship have been closed, missionaries driven forth, and the British and Foreign Bible Society's copies of the Bible seized; and the Education Office (save the mark!) declares, "We must be absolutely intolerant to ideas and views that are contrary to the [Roman] Catholic Church". Meanwhile American dignitaries like Archbishop Spellman sing pæans in praise of freedom. Has the Roman Church altered since Veuillot declared, "When we are in a minority we ask for religious liberty in the name of your [Protestant] principles. When we are in a majority we refuse it in the name of ours".

* * *

WHEREVER we move in Free Church circles we are asked to explain the sudden recent retraction in Church of England circles in all matters relating to reunion. Whether it be South India, education, or the new prominence of Archiepiscopal utterances, something has lowered the temperature of Anglican desire for union to the decidedly chilly. So far from welcoming with open hands and hearts the ministries God has recognized, as there seemed a disposition to do by the Bishops in 1920 and by many Anglicans, clerical and lay, since, the Archbishop of Canterbury makes a speech about regularity which we have not yet found anybody to

understand. So far from a genuine experimental united church, into which all parties enter on equal terms, making the contribution of their tried tradition, it is assumed beforehand that one tradition must triumph in thirty years. So far from an attempt by all non-Roman Christians to establish a system of education with the best education of the children its sole aim, there is the attempt to salvage as much of the dual system as possible at the expense of the community.

It is disappointing, and even distressing, to record this, and maybe the impression Free Churchmen have received is wrong. But in all parts of the country opinion is hardening: the feeling, even among those most sympathetic to union and most willing to co-operate, that the only union in which Anglicans are interested is absorption, finds abundant expression. Mr. Philip Hughes says in *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England*:

> The episcopal hierarchy, so the Catholic Church teaches as part of the Catholic faith, is not just a good means of ruling the Church, nor even the best means. It is the means divinely provided. It is of the very nature of the Catholic religion that it is a society ruled by bishops. To be ruled by bishops, to be a bishop-ruled institution, is an essential part of what God did in calling the Church into existence. Deprived of its hierarchy the Church would cease to live. The bishops are to it as a vital, natural organ. To suppress the episcopate would be as though we deprived a man of lungs or heart, and just as, if the whole Church could be deprived of bishops it would perish, so if in any part of it the local hierarchy is suppressed, Catholic life will inevitably wither away. Without bishops no part of the Church can live healthily. Suppress the hierarchy in any locality, muzzle it, fetter its activity—or let this be fettered by the incapacity or the indifference of those who compose the hierarchy—and Catholicism rapidly declines. So it has always been, so it must be. For it is the very nature of the Church that demands episcopal rule. . . . For ultimately episcopal action is indispensable to the Church's continued existence.

There is not the slightest doubt that in their heart of hearts many Anglicans believe this. And Free Churchmen do not: they regard its contentions as totally and demonstrably untrue. Bernard Manning, whom nobody can regard as being unfriendly to the Church of England, said:

> As long as, and only as long as, episcopacy menaces the doctrine of free grace Congregationalists will be relentless about it.

When the Archbishops and their people can remove that "As long as" Free Churchmen will not be slow to respond.

* * *

MR. R. A. BUTLER is rightly gratified by the reception of his education proposals, and no doubt we shall soon see them embodied in a Bill. He has been indefatigable in his survey of the problem, and we trust all Christians, and all men of goodwill, will support him in the steps forward he suggests. We could have wished for a little more courage in regard to the raising of the school age, nursery schools, and continuation schools. If the Bill is as tentative as the proposals, there will be a danger of the repetition of the 1919 experience, when education was first to feel the economy axe. On the question of religious education we have already expressed our views. If the Free Church Federal Council has failed to show the President of the Board of Education where his proposals fail to satisfy Nonconformist ideas of justice, an editorial in the *Methodist Recorder*, Dr. E. L. Langton in the *British Weekly*, and Mr. W. J. Rowland in the *Christian World*, may have succeeded. We wish that Mr. Butler had decided on the principle of a public school within reach of every child, and then built on that foundation. Instead, he starts from "We must accept the buildings we have", and so gives the moribund and inefficient dual system a new lease of life. Mr. H. C. Dent's mordant comment on the Churches' tender care for the children's souls with the disregard they have long shown for their bodies has, unhappily, much to support it. We await the terms of the Bill with interest, wishing that we could see any signs that those responsible for the non-provided schools are eager to put the interests of the children before their own. The recent outcry that a single system of education would be totalitarian is ludicrous to those who know the strength and tradition of local education authorities and the wide range of opinion among the teachers.

* * *

AMID all the ferment in Congregational circles two facts seem to crystallize:

(1) What must, for want of better terms, be called the Left and Right Wings are comparatively small in number. The main body of Congregationalists is either not interested in theological discussion and inclined to call "A plague on both your houses", or steadily walking in the centre of the evangelical road.

(2) The trouble with Congregationalism, at root, is that its churches have often ceased to be Congregational. Membership, as we have frequently said, is not regarded with the seriousness it once was; it is entered on far too easily; members therefore do not accept their responsibility as members and the church meeting ceases to function. From this results discrepancies between theory and practice, and wrong notions about worship and about the ministry and

> the sacraments. We often hear talk about re-educating the youth of Germany. There is need that this process should begin at home. How many young people joining a Congregational Church know what such a Church is and are prepared to take their responsibility in it? And if they are, how many of their elders are prepared to let them? Are the sixty or seventy people who now worship in the average Congregational Church Sunday by Sunday ready to give young men and women from the Services a full share in the life of their churches after the war? Or will they be deemed too young, or too negligible financially? They have been old enough and responsible enough to fly over Berlin and Nuremberg, to bring our food across the seas, to risk their lives in all corners of the earth. Shall they not be welcome to serve in the Church with the same courage, responsibility, and risk as they have served in the world?

* * *

In a recent number of *Theology* the Rev. G. W. Clarkson had some pertinent things to say in his "Reflections of a Post-War Ordinand". It would be well to bear them in mind in planning the work of the Churches after the war. Owing much to Knutsford and its training after the last war, nevertheless he urges that, if there is to be another Knutsford,

> there may be a little more grim imported into the gay, that there may be no more shortened courses, that nothing be allowed to take the place of study and discipline in the specialized things of theology and the devout life. The demands the world will make upon the priests of the future will be heaviest at the point of the spiritual life and the knowledge of divine truth. Knutsford doubtless got the Church round an awkward corner, so that the mousy curate, even on the stage, is well-nigh unintelligible to this generation, but the popular notion that "there must be something in the Gospel because broad-minded and full-blooded Mr. Boxer supports it" is probably more intolerable. Heartiness is not enough.

Translated out of its Anglican idiom, this has its relevance in every denomination. In eagerness to fill up the ranks of the ministry and to give proper value to war experience, it is easy to forget that training that is essential for successful life-work. Nevertheless, men who have had years of training in the hard world of war not only have special qualifications, but they are unlikely either to acquiesce in, or benefit by, prolonged training of an academic kind. Is not the solution of the problem to be found in the fact that the Church of tomorrow will require much greater variety in its ministry? Uniformity here, as elsewhere, is to be deprecated.

Even more important, however, is this paragraph:

Deacons and junior priests should not be given "practitioners' responsibilities" by being put in charge of organizations. Far too often are young men fresh from college given responsibility for "Youth". This is bad husbandry. It sets fumblers to work where they can do most harm, it increases the exploitation of charm, and in view of the fact that young clergymen migrate much sooner than they used to do, the continuation between the junior and the adult membership of the people they supervise is put in jeopardy at its unsafest period. This is a major cause of the leakage of adolescents, and England is crowded with curates' pets.

For long the Churches suffered from the notion that in Sunday Schools any unqualified person was good enough to "teach the infants"; for them and for adolescents alike only the best can do effective work. But perhaps the Churches are willing that professional Youth Club Leaders should take over their work.

* * *

It is the fashion in these days to sneer at the idea of progress, and to ridicule those Victorians who believed in it. Yet we cannot look at the photographs of boys' classes in the same school in the years 1895 and 1928 reprinted to Dr. Barker's *Britain and the British People* without being conscious that "It moves!"

And, even if children are now sometimes taught pretty little nature songs in Sunday School, they have not to learn the following, culled from *Prayers for Young Children*, published in 1835, which fell into our hands in the British Museum recently. On Monday evening the young child declares:

There is beyond the sky
A heav'n of joy and love;
And holy children when they die
Go to that world above.

There is a dreadful hell,
And everlasting pains;
Where sinners must with devils dwell,
In darkness, fire, and chains.

Can such a wretch as I
Escape this cursed end?
And may I hope, whene'er I die,
I shall to heav'n ascend?

Then will I read and pray
While I have life and breath;
Lest I should be cut off to-day
And sent t' eternal death.

Thanking God for the Bible on Wednesday morning, the child speaks of:

The danger I was in,
By nature and by practice too,
A wretched slave to sin.

That I am led to see
I can do nothing well,
And whither shall a sinner flee
To save himself from hell?

Never a day passes but the child is reminded of hell and eternal punishment. "I sing the almighty power of God" is the one redeeming feature, but on Saturday night we have:

'Tis to thy sov'reign grace I owe,
That I was born on British ground.
Where streams of heavenly mercy flow,
And words of sweet salvation sound.

I would not change my native land
For rich Peru with all her gold;
A nobler prize lies in my hand
Than East or Western Indies hold.

How do I pity those who dwell
Where ignorance and darkness reigns;
They know no heav'n, they fear no hell,
Those endless joys, those endless pains.

Thy glorious promises, O Lord,
Kindle my hopes and my desire,
While all the preachers of thy word
Warn me t' escape eternal fire.

Progress? We certainly think so. Not even the most enthusiastic of our neo-Calvinists will be bringing up their children on such teaching.

* * *

DR. W. E. SANGSTER in the *Methodist Recorder* has written a courageous survey of the position of the Methodist Church in the world of today. It will get him into trouble, without doubt, for many Christians are afraid to face the truth, and do not realize that "if hope of the better there be, it exacts a good look at the worse". Among the features Dr. Sangster notes are the following:

(1) "The steadily and steeply declining membership".
(2) "Many of our ministers are painfully depressed. . . . Depression does not belong to one age-group. 'Keeping the thing going' seems to be the summit of achievement to many men".
(3) "The disappointments of Methodist Union are notorious".
(4) Increasing financial burdens.

Such is the diagnosis. Dr. Sangster goes on:

> If we were not sure that we were dear to God and that nothing bars us from all the resources of Heaven but the poverty of our prayers, we might well despair and accept the judgment of our critics that we are just papering the rooms while the house falls down.

And the remedy? In Dr. Sangster's words:

> The recovery of the intimate fellowship of the class-meeting.
> The gift of assurance from God.
> The passion for holiness.
> The duty of personal evangelism.

Diagnosis and remedy alike apply to all the Churches, and not only to Methodism.

* * *

Is anyone, we wonder, keeping a register of all the churches are doing for men and women in the Services? Sometimes the question is asked, almost with a sneer, by those who have no conception, either of the range and variety of the work or of its difficulty when church buildings have been seized by military and local authorities for their own uses. All over the country canteens are being run—there are fine examples in Bournemouth, Colchester, and Glasgow—sometimes by individual churches, at others by churches working together. In Newport, Mon., over thirty churches and other religious organizations co-operate to run a hostel where men and women whose journeys necessitate a stay for a night or part of a night can secure a bed. Each church contributes 5s. weekly, and supplies workers for a week in rotation. The number of guests accommodated must now be nearing 100,000. Some record of work of this kind should be kept for future reference.

Incidentally it may be noted that if any of this service was begun with the ulterior motive of benefiting the churches by increasing congregations, it has been a failure. Generally it was started from a genuine desire to help men and women away from home, though here and there a vision of "Forces" flocking into the church building at service-time may have dazzled the eyes of ministers and deacons. Almost universally the report is that there is no such mass-movement: uniforms in ordinary congregations are so few as to be conspicuous. So much so that ministers and church officers are appalled at the width of the chasm between organized Christianity and the people, as represented by the Services of today. How that chasm can be bridged is the problem which should be monopolizing the attention of the best minds in the churches and claiming the prayers of all.

* * *

THE summer is over, and soon Congregationalists will be hearing of the progress and prospects of the Reconstruction Fund. It is a

sign of life that everywhere the desire is expressed that in the administration of the Fund there should be mobility of resources and readiness to experiment, and the determination that the generosity and sacrifice should not find their outlet in mere rebuilding. Here are some plans that have been suggested for the future. Let all with ideas bring them out into the open in good time:

(1) The formation of bodies of shock-troops, ministerial and lay, to tackle special problems. This, we trust, will be on a more extensive scale than the Methodist "commandos". Here is a town with half-a-dozen Congregational churches. Not one of them has a good congregation, though some have church rolls of considerable length. Their Sunday Schools are moribund, and their Young People's organizations dormant. If this group of churches would invite the "reconstructors" to pay a visit, we should like to see a dozen men and women descend on the town for three or four months, visit every church member, consult with ministers and deacons about future plans and fuller co-operation between the churches, and then pass on to another town.

(2) That a dozen ministers of standing, whose family responsibilities are decreasing or have ceased, be asked to relinquish their churches and place themselves at the call of the Union for five years to undertake special tasks.

(3) That new types of ministry be established to meet varying situations—adult education, youth clubs, down-town churches, *etc.*

(4) That the Colleges set up refresher courses for ministers and courses of training for laymen, the Fund making maintenance allowances where necessary to give the laymen freedom.

These are but some of the ideas being ventilated in Fraternals and Common Rooms. The younger men especially are open-minded in looking to the future. The trouble is that still their plans, when they discuss them in New Advance groups or less formally, are so often watered down by fearful saints of older growth, who once more want to play for safety. "Put not your trust in—buildings, or in invested funds" is sound counsel for the Church of today if there is to be a Church of tomorrow.

* * *

A READER sends a Trade Union journal giving an account of its annual meeting in the Memorial Hall, London. Its reporters are severe on the Hall—its acoustics, the hardness of the seats (these Trade Unionists seem to be accustomed to more luxury than delegates to the Congregational Union!), the ventilation, the long climb to it, the cathedral gloom, the noise of the traffic,

> the brass (surely not!) wall-plates recording the names of departed pillars of Nonconformity (not all departed, surely) [which] all combined to make us far removed from all earthly things and induce a Sabbatarian somnolence.

On one point, however, the critic is right. He is very "down on" speakers who rely on the microphone and do not trouble to make their voices carry. He points out that the fathers of Nonconformity who built the Hall knew how to make themselves heard, and quotes the words of an observer at the Labour Party Conference:

> A badly used "mike" is the curse of most public meetings today, and in most cases there is no need for a "mike" at all if people will use their natural voices as of old. It is just gadget for gadget's sake, as needlessly imposed on the meeting room as the crooners have imposed it on the music-halls.

* * *

WHY are people so afraid of being misunderstood in matters of religion? In one of his letters George S. Gordon gives the list of the best six companionable English books as Pepys, Walton's *Compleat Angler*, Boswell's *Johnson*, *Tristram Shandy*, Cowper's Letters, and *Eothen*, and says, "Why not *The Bible*? Why not? But it might be misunderstood".

This immediately brought to mind a conversation between Bishop Gore and a Congregational minister on the hill overlooking Lausanne one Sunday morning during the Conference of 1927. The Bishop welcomed the improved understanding between the Free Churches and the Anglican Church, on which his friend commented, "Yes, indeed. And when are you coming to preach for me at Clapton Park?", and received the reply, "I don't see why I shouldn't. I really don't see why I shouldn't, my dear boy. But I'd better not. I'd better not. *It might be misunderstood*". Shall we get *anywhere* in matters of religion while we are so fearful of doing and saying the things that we feel to be right in scorn of consequence?

* * *

MISS MARGARET T. MONRO'S *A Book of Unlikely Saints*, reviewed within, has caused us some uncomfortable moments. Its underlying theme is that of expiation, and it portrays some young people who offered themselves to suffer for the sins of the world. We now live at a time when theologians talk a great deal about sin, and when we are all painfully conscious of the evil in man's heart. But where do we find, in any of the Churches, expiation? Where are the leaders of the Churches—Cardinals, Archbishops, Moderators—offering their lives in expiation for the sins which have plunged the world into war? Is there in any of us the agony and anguish which the heart of the Father of all men must feel as he gazes on his warring children? Nay, is there any uneasy consciousness that all is not well with us because we are not sharing the fellowship of the Divine suffering? And do we make any effort to find the way to share it?

And while on Miss Monro's book may we suggest a paragraph for discussion in Common Rooms, Fraternals, and Study Circles?

> The outstanding character of the modern era is the way it has taken back, bit by bit, what the Middle Ages had surrendered to God. Politics went first—it had always been the incompletest surrender. Men only too readily followed Machiavelli in his claim that politics is a law unto itself, amenable to no higher law. This, applied in both national and international spheres, has given us the chaos of modern Europe, as well as what is chaotic in the influence of the white man overseas. Economics soon followed politics. Banking, trade and manufacture threw off allegiance to any principle higher than the profits of those engaged in these gainful pursuits. Knowledge went next, degenerating into irresponsible opinion as it substituted subjective for objective criteria of truth. Last of all, marriage and the home have been taken from God and subjected to purely human wisdom. Undeterred by the appalling results of this policy in other fields, it is now proposed to make man the arbiter of the transmission of life itself.

* * *

We await with interest news from the United States of the consideration of the proposals of union between the Evangelical and Reformed Church and the Congregational-Christian Churches. If the union should take place it will be a remarkable achievement, and, if the group really becomes one, even strikingly significant. Some facts we on this side are inclined to overlook, even if we are aware of them at all, are these:

1. The two parties have a common background, it is true, but it is away back on the continent of Europe in the 16th century.
2. There are elements in the groups whose theologies are wide apart. This is perhaps due even more to the presence in Congregationalism of those who would not disclaim the description "Unitarian" than to extreme conservatives in the Evangelical and Reformed Church.
3. The fusion would be a welcome mingling of varying social grades (it would be at the risk of our lives that we used the term "classes" in referring to the United States!). In the States the Congregationalists are those with a history of culture and often of wealth behind them; this is true not merely of New England but of the Middle West, which was evangelized from New England. The Evangelical and Reformed Church in the Middle West contains a labouring group which Congregationalism, generally speaking, has failed to attract.

These three facts, even more than the difference in government—the Evangelical and Reformed government is Presbyterian—

suggest that the union will be far more important than a union of two Churches with a recent common tradition, the same theology, and composed of people of the same social grades.

* * *

MANY tributes have been paid to the life and work of Dr. William Paton, one of the best-known and most-travelled churchmen of our time, and one whose knowledge and judgment seemed destined to be of the greatest service to Christendom in the immediate future. "Bill" Paton's work for the Student Christian Movement brought him into contact with people in all the Churches, and laid the foundation for his future work. On the Mission Field and in the United States he had many friends, and this enriched the contribution he made through his books and speeches. It is perhaps natural that we should regard his work as Editor of the *International Review of Missions* as most important of all. Paton had an eye for knowledgeable contributors, but more than that: he discerned trends in missionary activity at an early stage, and accurately judged which experiments were likely to be successful. A study of the *I.R.M.* during the period of his editorship should be obligatory on all preparing for the Mission Field. Its annual survey of missionary enterprise has always been masterly and reliable. The news of his death came as a shock to all who looked to him for leadership in the World Council of the Christian Churches, but did not surprise those who knew of his serious illness in America in 1940. There, as in this country, he rarely rested, and he was hard at work on the voyage home. He crossed the Atlantic again in 1942, and there is little doubt that his frequent journeys in war-time told on his physical strength. Some of his latest books were criticized in the United States because they were said to view the post-war world as an Anglo-American hegemony. This will seem strange to those who knew the place of the "Younger Churches" in his thoughts, but it perhaps rightly suggests that he had a leaning to the authoritative and the established; it is doubtful, for example, if he ever appreciated the genius of Congregationalism, or of a conception of the Church as undogmatic yet evangelical, catholic yet free. It is with pleasure that we look back to our suggestion that it was more than time one of the Scottish Universities gave him a D.D. degree. Soon after Edinburgh did so. No doubt it was *post* not *propter*, but it was gratifying to have our judgment confirmed.

* * *

THE Presbyterians have had a great time recently, with 1643 and 1843 both to celebrate. They have commemorated worthily, and notably in the literature published. Of Prof. Hugh Watt's *Thomas Chalmers and the Disruption* we have already written, and those who want to learn in a pleasant manner about the Westminster

Assembly could not do better than read Dr. S. W. Carruthers's *The Everyday Work of the Westminster Assembly* (Presbyterian Historical Society, 12s. 6d.). The combination of ecclesiastical historian, medical man, and preacher is rare indeed, and the Presbyterian Church is indeed fortunate in the possession of Dr. Carruthers.

* * *

MEMBERS of Congregational Churches in England may like to compare their church budgets with the Church of Scotland's Proportional Division of contributions per £:

	s.	*d.*
Maintenance of the Ministry	5	2½
Aged and Infirm Ministers		5¾
Foreign Mission	5	7½
Women's Foreign Mission	3	11¾
Home Mission	1	8½
Women's Home Mission		8¼
Church and Manse Building		1¾
Highlands and Islands		3¾
Christian Life and Work		2¼
Social Work		3½
Women's Temperance		¾
Colonial Churches		2½
Jewish Missions		3½
Women's Jewish Mission		3¾
Work on the Continent		2¼
Education for the Ministry		1½
Youth and Education		2¾
	20	0

* * *

SOMETIMES we think that clericalism is indeed the enemy, and we propose to examine this proposition in another issue. Meanwhile it is good to find that the minister is often put in his place:

1. Here is a bill announcing a Sunday School Anniversary:
   Preacher: Dr. A. P., of London.
   Come and Hear the Children.
2. The minister is to stay in a home for the week-end. On Friday night, after his usual prayers, the small son of 5 ends: "And thank you, God, for Dr. P. Thank you for everything. Amen".
   Mother: "But you don't know Dr. P. You've never seen him.
   Son: "No, but I've always wanted to sleep in this bed. And I shouldn't be if Dr. P. weren't coming".

* * *

ACCORDING to a Cumberland newspaper,

> Professor Patrick Abercrombie, who planned the Lake District, has been presented with the Howard Memorial Medal for his services to planning.

On which "Lucio" of the *Manchester Guardian* comments:

> Before the hills in order stood,
> Or earth received its frame,
> Prof. Abercrombie was so good
> As to arrange the same.

* * *

James Begg (1808-83) related that William Thom of Govan once preached before the magistrates on the Ethiopian Church, and said,

> Suppose you saw one of our public authorities riding in his chariot, certainly not a very unlikely thing. But suppose you saw him reading the prophet Esias, a highly improbable thing. But suppose, further, you were to say to him, "Understandest thou what thou readest?", a highly necessary question in such circumstances. Do you suppose he would say, "How can I except some man *guide* me?" This is the very last thing that would enter a modern magistrate's head. He would say, "What right have you to ask? Go about your business".

Preaching on another occasion before the magistrates he suddenly halted and cried,

> "Dinna snore sae loud, Bailie Brown; ye'll wauken the Provost".

* * *

We give a warm welcome to the Rev. W. Stanyon, who has become one of our proof-readers, frankly confessing that this is an instance of giving office—or, at any rate, work—to a critic. No one of our readers has had a keener eye for a misprint or for slovenly English than Mr. Stanyon, and we are grateful to him for coming to our aid when our staff is much depleted. Meanwhile, congratulations to the Rev. Maldwyn Johnes, the only reader to point out that "J. T. Hearne" in our last issue should have been "J. W.". In order to save paper the Index for 1943 will be sent only to those who ask for it and send threepence to Independent Press, Memorial Hall, London, E.C.4.

* * *

Mr. Mark C. Robson, the Ex-Chairman of the Durham and Northumberland Congregational Union, writes:

> Whilst one can sympathize with the Rev. G. F. Nuttall in his discomfort at the adaptability of the West End Church at Newcastle, one must bear in mind that the needs of a new area of population can only be met to the extent that resources will allow.
>
> The West End premises are being used for worship only until such time as funds are available for building a Church. The Church Extension Committee was faced with the problem of providing a centre for religious work in the midst of a large area consisting mainly of working class families, and with but slender financial backing. In fact, the principal resources were an abundance of faith and a keen sense of duty.
>
> It appeared to the Committee that the children and Young People must

be their primary consideration, and a building most adaptable to such work was decided upon. Construction was of a permanent nature, and accordingly, of sound and of good quality material throughout. Realizing that the main hall would require to be used for Church services, the architect designed with this in view. The result was both dignified and pleasing. This was no ordinary hall. The high, curved ceiling, large leaded windows with coloured design, parquet flooring, altar, pulpit, and rush-bottomed chairs provided an atmosphere for worship not equalled in many churches one could name.

The success of this new centre of worship has justified the "adaptable" outlook of the founders. The large hall is surrounded by smaller halls and class-rooms used by a Sunday School of over 300 children and young people's organizations of all kinds. Surely this is the type of building required in the first place in any new area: a building adaptable to work of all kinds seven days a week.

Although a debt of £2,000 still remains on West End, hopes of building a real church after the War on land adjoining are in the ascendant, and the scheme will then be complete.

Mr. Nuttall may be assured that the large congregations do not feel any lack of worshipful environment.

Concerts and public meetings are held in the hall on relatively few occasions. The chairs are turned around to face the curtained platform, the altar and pulpit shut off, and a comfortable and pleasant hall with a worshipful background provides an asset of undoubted value.

A religious and social centre has been provided first; the church will follow, we hope.

* * *

STOP PRESS.

THE day after the above notes were written Italy surrendered. We rejoice in the news, for it means that many lives will be saved, for an opposed landing might have been very costly. The Germans will fight as long as they can in Italy to keep the fighting away from their own soil, but the end is a step nearer. We cannot but sympathize with the women and children of Italy, brought into such suffering by the pride and treachery of Mussolini.

News has also arrived of a new move by the Soviet Government in regard to religion, though it is not clear as yet what it involves. We shall watch eagerly to see if any rights of worship and activity secured by the Orthodox Church are extended to those "evangelical" and "spiritual" forms of religion to which Miliukov devotes so much attention.

BERTRAM SMITH (1864-1943)

I. By the Rev. Francis Wrigley, B.A.

It was in September, 1885, when Bertram Smith and I met each other in the garden of Rotherham College. He came from Brighton, I came from Carlisle, to begin our work as students for the Christian Ministry. He was 21 years of age and I was 17. From the first hour in the garden we seemed to begin our friendship, a friendship which lasted for nearly 60 years. We went on that first day for an evening walk, and we have been walking through life together ever since. As I review the past I am constrained to believe, in a peculiar measure, in the guiding hand of God.

Before our College days were over we were resolved to take hold of a down-town church which had lost its ancient greatness, but which was still within range of a large working class constituency. Salem was the church that won our hearts. There were very few people who belonged to it, but they were very kind, and we set to work to carry out our dream. For 38 years we ministered to that church, and we rejoiced to see it grow in strength and influence and magnitude.

What brilliant service my colleague rendered! He was a born organizer, a born optimist, and a born leader. I was always amazed at his intellectual gifts. He was able to deal with all sorts of public questions and subtle problems, and he had a business capacity which few could equal. His preaching was instructive and helpful to the last degree.

He loved the children of the Sunday School, and especially he cared for the young men who came under his influence. How many lads he sent out into the world with new ideals, intellectual equipment and moral anchorage. Many of them today are holding high positions. Seven of them are doing fine work as ministers of Christ. We cannot measure the extent of my colleague's influence. He has gone from us but the good he has done will never be forgotten. We thank God for every remembrance of him.

II. By the Rev. H. J. S. Guntrip, B.A., B.D.

Bertram Smith was, in no conventional sense, a powerful personality. He united qualities often seen apart, yet rarely found together in the same mind. He possessed, in the first place, a great organizing capacity and keen business ability. The structure of

Salem bears the stamp of his wisdom and foresight. Coming to a church on the point of extinction, he saw that there need be no financial problem if the real needs of the people were met. He and his colleague cast aside fearlessly the merely conventional and traditional ways of running a church, and built up a living organism, pulsating with interest, activity, and the spirit of service.

In the second place Bertram Smith was an intellect of the first order, with marked philosophic ability. Fearless thinking, a bold modernist theology, tremendous faith in the reality of progress and the power of true ideas, worked in him, and left their stamp on successive generations of Salem youth. His philosophy study-circles and challenging preaching are remembered to this day.

Finally, he had the sympathy and understanding of "a great human". He knew life at first hand, not merely from books, though few read more deeply. His courageous "social gospel" sprang from his intimate knowledge of the problems and homes of Hunslet, and his application of the Christian ethic to everyday social, economic, and political conditions. He had a practical and human intellect, and was equally at home cooking over a camp fire, debating Hegel's philosophy, or solving the problems of a hard-hit Hunslet family. But above all he was a great Christian for whom the life of the spirit was the supreme reality; a man of no petty personal motives, who asked little for himself and gave all to others.

HERESY

By E. E. Kellett, M.A.

Words, like human beings, are always in danger of degenerating. Very many that began with good, or, at worst, neutral meanings, have in time gathered evil associations, or have become in some way vulgarized, so as often to be employed as terms of insult, missiles appropriate for vigorous vituperation, or conveyers of contempt. Such, to choose familiar examples, are "imp" and "wench". Cupid, in Spenser, is an imp, or child, of Venus; to Titus Andronicus his beloved daughter is a sweet wench. But perhaps this tendency is most clearly seen in certain words adopted by political or religious parties, words to which the enemies of the parties can scarcely avoid lending an accent of disdain or hatred. Such is "Pharisee", a word originally connoting simply "separation", but bestowed on the famous sect by its enemies to imply that it considered itself too holy to associate with less pious people. Not dissimilar is "Puritan", a name which in its primary significance anyone might be proud to deserve, but which, nowadays, we all deprecate. What is commoner than to hear a sentence like "I am no Puritan, but——". Something of the same kind might perhaps be said about "Bolshevism", which, at any rate on Fascist lips, is a compendious expression for everything abominable.

But, among all the words which have suffered this fate, none, I imagine, is more remarkable or more deserving of study than the word "heresy", which plays in history a part hardly less prominent than war itself, and which stirs in the mind associations as horrible and painful as any other one can recall. Yet, till the rise of Christianity, often as it occurs in Greek literature, it is impossible to detect the slightest trace of such associations. I open my Liddell and Scott, and there I find various explanations: first, simply "choice"; then "election", as of magistrates; next, "a striving after", "inclination", "preference", then "a philosophic principle". Finally, but without any implication of censure, "those who profess such a philosophic principle". Not till we reach Josephus and the *New Testament* do we come across phrases bearing a certain religious emphasis, as the "heresy" or "sect" of the Essenes. Even in the *Septuagint* it occurs with the strange significance of "a freewill offering": certainly bearing no idea of censure. From this point we see it gradually taking on something of its present connotation. The Jews used it as we should use the word "party" or at worst "sect". "After the way which they call a

heresy", says St. Paul, "so serve I the God of our fathers": but what he felt was apparently rather the tone in which the word was used than anything in the word itself; for he used it quite neutrally when he declared that "after the most straitest heresy" of the Jewish religion he had, in his early days, lived a Pharisee; much as a Quaker might say he belonged to a somewhat strict denomination. We are told in *Acts* that the High Priest Annas was of the "heresy" of the Sadducees. Using a similarly colourless phrase, *Luke* says that there were certain of the heresy of the Pharisees who believed in Christ. But that the word was already beginning to carry the possibility of conveying, in an appropriate context, a certain stigma, seems to be indicated when the "orator" Tertullus, speaking before Felix, denounced Paul as "a pestilent fellow, and a ringleader of the heresy of the Nazarenes". Here we may detect something of the same tone which, a few decades ago, an extreme Anglo-Catholic would throw into the phrase "the Church and the sects". Nor is St. Paul himself speaking very mildly when, in *Galatians*, he points a climatic sentence with the words "jealousies, wraths, divisions, heresies", and excludes those who practise such things from the Kingdom of God. From this point the story is easy to follow. In the Epistle to Titus, which is one of Paul's very latest letters if he did actually write it, we find him bidding Titus reject "a man that is heretical" if two or three admonitions fail; and the author of the so-called *Second Peter* forebodes with anxiety the coming appearance among the churches to which he is writing of men privily bringing in destructive heresies. The *R.V.*, which has hitherto generally preferred to translate the Greek word by "sects", in these cases, I conceive, does right in retaining the *A.V.;* for the Revisers recognized that it had attained practically its present meaning.

Henceforward this employment of the word becomes incessant. Everybody who proclaimed a theological view different from that of others received from them the opprobrious soubriquet, and was consigned by them, without remorse, to reprobation in this world and to eternal flames in the next. Anyone who wishes to study the rhetoric of denunciation will see it at its zenith in the works of the early Fathers, though occasionally the heretics are fully equal to the orthodox. Not Cicero in his attacks on Catiline or Antony is more recklessly furious than Tertullian in his Philippics against the heretics of his time, or more unscrupulously savage than Cyril in his persecution of Nestorius. Whole legends of abusive "biography" were compiled against Simon Magus, and the true story of the Gnostics cannot be easily unravelled from the caricatures composed against them. St. Paul himself, as is well known, did not escape detraction: his "Petrine" adversaries gave a picture of him very different from that we find in *Acts*. It is some satisfaction to know

that Tertullian himself, after a few years, by becoming a follower of Montanus, earned the fatal nickname, and thus forfeited for ever the title of "Saint", which many thousands of men with nothing like equal claims to such recognition won, and still triumphantly wear.

And so the thing went on, till, when the Church gained the power, we find the heretic treated as a traitor was treated by the State, or even worse. As he was to burn in hell, it was only right he should suffer the pains of burning on earth. Almost forgetting allegory and symbolism for a while, Dante meets the shades of famous heresiarchs in the flames of the City of Dis: for were not Epicurus, Mohammed, and Farinata literally burning at the time in a literal Inferno? As for later heretics, their very numbers have thrown them into undeserved obscurity. Did not even Sir Thomas More, who in Utopia had maintained the cause of freedom of thought and speech, himself as Chancellor condemn to death some heretics—though not, as he said, for thinking as they did, but for publishing their thoughts? Mary's victims—Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley—are familiar to all, but there are many others whose names it is a hard task to rake from the dust of old oblivion. Under Elizabeth it was fatal to be an Anabaptist. Calvin, chief of all heretics in Roman eyes, burnt Servetus at the stake for holding views of Christ's nature which did not square with Calvin's own. But the list, even the fractional one containing well-known names, is far too long to bear repetition here.

Though it is no part of the purpose of this essay to treat of heresies in detail, to distinguish Arianism from Semi-Arianism, to explore the profundities of Gnosticism, or to discover where precisely Paul of Samosata went astray, yet I consider it not irrelevant to try to discover wherein heresy in general differs from Catholicism, and to mark out, as simply as is possible, the terribly narrow path along which orthodoxy moves—a path so perilous that a single false step may land the incautious in everlasting perdition. Not unnaturally, therefore, my thoughts have turned to a few ancient writings in which these questions are discussed. Such are Irenaeus, the *Panarium* of Epiphanius—he found a huge number of heterodox writers to denounce—Hippolytus's *Refutation of All Heresies,* and some others. To these I could add, if ever I so desired, Hefele's monumental *History of the Councils,* in which every important point is brought out with the utmost clearness, and with a fairness absolutely astonishing in a Roman prelate. Since Councils and Synods were very often summoned to decide whether certain opinions were heretical or not—as, for instance, to settle whether repentant heretics needed to be rebaptized—it is obvious that such a work must be of great assistance to anyone engaged in a search like mine.

But, as no reader will be surprised to hear, my thoughts turned specially to the most famous book on the subject ever written, short, vigorous, and simple. It happened that I had on my shelves a copy of a translation of Peregrinus, that is Vincentius Lirinensis, *Against Heresy*, made in 1651, and revised in 1841[1]. I had read this book many years before, but it would be as well to revive my memory of it, and I took it down from the shelves. Some of it was still familiar, but all proved interesting, especially as my opinions had altered considerably since I had last seen it. It is, as everybody knows, a commentary on one of the most famous sentences in all literature—a sentence which probably gave the book its vogue. Orthodoxy, it proclaims, is *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—that which has been believed always, everywhere, and by everybody. As it stands, this saying is utterly ridiculous; there is scarcely any truth, however obvious, of which so much can be asserted: and Vincent was compelled, by mere common sense, to qualify it as soon as he had given it utterance. For one thing, it happened that at that very time the Roman Empire was Arian, or at best Semi-Arian, in creed; and even if we assume that the age was exceptional, it is an exception which is enough to invalidate Vincent's rule. *Ab omnibus* and *semper* become therefore mere question-begging words; and *ubique*, if Vincent had deigned to look at Asia or Arabia, would have proved equally misleading. He is therefore compelled to say that by *semper* he means at best "usually", by *ubique* "in most places"—and those almost all in the Graeco-Roman Empire—and by *omnibus* "the majority". Nay, he goes further, and confesses, or rather boasts, that by "the majority" he means the majority of bishops assembled in Councils, which, for some reason not clearly stated, he assumes to have been infallible. Scripture, including the *Old Testament*, is also infallible, probably because Councils have declared it to be so; but on the other hand infallible Scripture lends plausibility to the decisions of infallible Councils. It is, however, often obscure or insufficient, and requires the decisions of Councils to interpret or supplement it. As for argument to prove these infallibilities, there is none; nor are we told how to be sure that any Council that may be called in the future is one on which we may unhesitatingly rely. One of them, at any rate, though summoned with much flourishing of trumpets, was later declared to be worse than mistaken, and, in the vigorous language so familiar to readers of ecclesiastical history, has been dubbed the Robber Council. Vincent, of course, could not foresee the Protestant schism, and therefore could not know that the time would come when a large fraction of the Christian community would

[1] This revision, Thomas Mozley tells us, he was asked by Newman to make: but he was dilatory, and the work was done by another—he thinks Charles Marriott.

refuse to pay attention to the decisions of any Council after the Fourth.

The modern reader of Vincent's book will observe that, as was natural and excusable in a writer of the fifth century, he was not troubled by contradictions, impossibilities, or immoralities in the Scriptural documents. He could, for instance, read the second chapter of *Genesis* immediately after the first without perceiving that both cannot be true. Like St. Jude, he would have believed that the apocryphal *Book of Enoch* was written by the seventh man in descent from Adam; and he quotes so-called speeches of Moses as if they contained precepts which Christians two thousand years later were bound to obey, and prophecies fulfilled in the appearance of heretics in Italy or Gaul. In other matters, too, he is equally unhistorical. Everywhere, in speaking of the Councils, he betrays his ignorance of the fact, now familiar to all theological students, that in the earliest days of the Church presbyter and bishop were two names for one thing. But what is specially interesting is his judgments of character. To him there is something morally laudable in "orthodoxy" *per se,* that is, in the blind and unquestioning acceptance of Conciliar decisions, or of that which, in his famous hyperbolical rhetoric, may be called *quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*. On the other hand, there is something morally reprehensible in heterodoxy, that is, in holding an opinion not in harmony with that of the majority. Whether the heretic has reached this opinion after close, long-continued, and honest study or not, makes no difference. His business is to submit his mind to that of others, to crush his convictions as blasphemous, and to live a life of intellectual slavery. He is therefore, like Galileo centuries later, to profess a lie, to say one thing with his lips and think the opposite with his mind. If he does not do this, he is perverse, wicked, and reprobate[2].

That this is Vincent's view may be shown by a few examples out of many that might be chosen. The Manichean doctrine as to the Person of Christ is a "horrible and wicked mockery". Nestorius, Apollinaris, and Photinus, like mad dogs, barked against the Catholic faith; and "be Nestorius accursed". Pelagius, like Sabellius, is "wicked", Arius "profane", Novatian "cruel". Simon Magus, and his follower Priscillian, are in Vincent's eyes the protagonists of Gnosticism, and therefore men from whom came "the sink of all filthiness".

[2] This has involved some excellent men in the most terrible perplexities. Thus Hefele, the first-rate scholar already mentioned, declared, during the Vatican Council of 1870, that he had studied ecclesiastical history for fifty years, and never come across any authoritative statement whatever in favour of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. When the decree was passed, he hesitated long, but finally decided that, to avoid creating a schism, it was his duty to accept it. I am not sure that we ought not to mingle a certain censure with a deep sympathy.

Here the good presbyter of Lirins is far from alone. To take but one example. According to the historian Socrates, Arius was proud, ambitious, insincere, and cunning; Epiphanius calls him a perfidious serpent; and Bishop Alexander, for long his close friend, no sooner found that he held strange views on the Trinity, than he discovered also that his avarice was portentous, and that the fascinating manners which had once attracted everybody including his Bishop, were too visible in his relations with women. The Emperor Constantine—not one, perhaps, whose witness will carry conviction to all minds—writes of him as if he were the worst of criminals.

At times, it is true, Vincent finds it impossible to deny all merit to his heretics. He cannot help confessing the amazing greatness of Origen, whom no Christian but venerated almost as a prophet, and a man of such "wit, learning, and grace'" that no wonder one said of him, "I would rather err with Origen than be right with others". Yet these very gifts tended not only to the glory of religion; they were the measure of the power of the temptation which finally overcame him. His "error" sprang from pride and presumption; he thought too highly of himself, and imagined he could despise the men of ancient times—that is, if I may paraphrase Vincent's words, he was brave enough to speak out honestly that which, after long study and reflection, he had come to regard as the truth on an exceedingly mysterious point of doctrine.

On Tertullian the verdict is much the same—though here, as we have hinted, our sympathies are less strongly with the victim than in the case of the great Greek theologian; for Tertullian's own attacks on the "villainous and blasphemous" Marcion and Apelles, Praxeas and Hermogenes, Gnostics, Jews, and Gentiles, had been such as to make us feel that Nemesis was only fair when she dealt him in his turn a slight dose of the same treatment. Tertullian, says Vincent, who had been far from revolted by his furious assaults on the heretics, was "more eloquent than faithful when he adopted the novel madness of Montanus". He was, in fact, like Origen, proud and presumptuous; the kind of false teacher foreboded by Moses when he announced that "a naughty prophet" would arise who by great tokens and miracles would lead men to follow strange gods, and to whom, despite all his attractions, the Israelites were to refuse to listen, for the Lord their God was but testing them, to see if they were truly faithful or not. Like that prophet, Tertullian was "speaking presumptuously".

Heresy, then, involving not merely theological error but moral obliquity, was justly condemned to ostracism in this world and damnation in the next. If Moses had proclaimed that the presumptuous prophet should die, so the Church might proclaim that the heterodox teacher should at least suffer excommunication with

all its consequences: and thus, to round off the censure passed by a Council or Synod on any particular variety of heresy, we find regularly the words *Anathema esto;* and this means that he who persistently cleaves to it can hardly escape the flames of hell. Here is the justification of the burnings of heretics which fill so large a space in later history—physical tortures which, despite all human ingenuity, can never be more than a pale shadow of those which await the wretches after death.

We have thus learned what orthodoxy is—it is simply the opinion of the majority; and by consequence we have learned what heresy is—an opinion, on some particular subject, which does not agree with that of the majority. But the conclusion to which Vincent's dissertation leads any man of a liberal mind is precisely opposed to that which he draws. Heresy, so far from being a wickedness, is a binding duty; or at any rate every honest man is bound to run the risk of it. So far from being obliged to accept without hesitation the views of others, he is, so far as his means and opportunities allow, under moral compulsion to subject those views to close and impartial examination. While fully recognizing that he himself may err, he must not forget that so may those others. To take his views from them is an act of cowardice. In the immortal words of Milton,

> a man may be a heretick in the truth, and if he beleeve things only because his Pastor sayes so, or the Assembly so determine, without knowing other reason, the very truth he holds becomes his heresie.

Apart from this, there is a second heresy, and no other real one in the world: that of refusing to entertain your heresy when convinced of its truth.

All remember also the saying of Voltaire, that, though totally disagreeing with the opinions of a man with whom he had been conversing, he would maintain to the death the man's right to hold them. He might have gone further, and used the word "duty" instead of "right"—for if the man had honestly reached them he was bound not to suppress them.

But this leads us to a final view. No one else has the right to suppress them—neither the State nor the Church nor society in general. Anything in the line of suppression means the loss of what may well be valuable; for, to quote the *Areopagitica* once again, "all opinions, yea, errors, known, read, and collated, are of main service and assistance toward the speedy attainment of what is truest". If the State suppresses inconvenient opinions, we may fall into the condition of the Hitlerian Germany, which has, to the terrible injury of the whole world, welcomed Hitler as its "Pastor" and the Nazi party as its "Assembly". It is the reverse of a consolation that a Hitlerian government would not suppress

an opinion if it did not perceive that there was in it some truth, or at least plausibility, which might convince many that the Führer's ideas were false. This is precisely the point. In suppressing opinions you run a serious risk of depriving the people of the truth.

One would not wish to conclude without a word of admiration and gratitude given to those men, whether theologians, politicians, or social reformers, of all ages and countries, who have faced obloquy, imprisonment, torture, and death, in the cause of what they have decided to be right.

We fear that many readers of *Midnight Hour* will be disappointed in *Renascence* (Faber, 8s. 6d.), the work of *Nicodemus*—the veil of anonymity is wearing very thin: who but Mr. —— could have written of Walter Pater—"a famous and lustrous passage of his more empurpled prose"? *Midnight Hour,* written at white heat, described a personal experience; *Renascence* may—for what place have the papers on "The Home Guard" and "The Masque of May" in "an essay in faith"?—give the impression of capitalizing the interest the earlier book aroused. The student who neglects the book for this reason will be unwise. Nor would he be wise to say, "Oh, the old *C.N.-L.* obsessions again—Rilke, Kierkegaard, Buber, T. S. Eliot". These are there, no doubt; but it is when he forgets them that Nicodemus is most vital. He falls a prey, too, to the antithetical heresy—transcendence and immanence, spirit and flesh, God and man, Augustine and Pelagius, either or—and forgets that "the word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thine heart"; but on personality, community, "The Two Wisdoms", and "The Two Christianities" he has something timely to say. We like, too, his emphasis on the uncompromising nature of Christianity and the passion of his "open letter" on "The Skin Game". What would be good for him—and incidentally, for the *Christian News-Letter* group generally—would be a course in Congregationalism, where, ideally if it frequently fails in practice, the problem of community comes nearer solution than anywhere else. *Sir* Gilbert Murray?

Alterham, the scene of Mr. Michael Nugent's *The Shrine* (Dakers, 8s. 6d.), has competitive Roman and Anglican shrines, and the self-contained village has all the jealousy, gossip, and wire-pulling common to such. With the description of this is interwoven the story of a Catholic wife, and mother of two children, who finds herself with child by a Catholic lover.

Miss Phyllis Bottome's style is not impeccable, and perhaps she handicapped herself unduly by throwing *Within the Cup* (Faber, 8s. 6d.) into the first person, but she can tell a story. Psychologists will appreciate the glimpses into the methods of the Viennese psychiatrist who tells it, but the account of the blitz on Plymouth, which is very vivid, will best please the ordinary reader. It is, we understand, wise not to mix one's drinks; certainly we prefer our psychoanalysis neat!

Miss Ruth Feiner has already shown she can tell a story. *The Twain Met* (Dakers, 9s. 6d.) shows that she has too a rare gift of psychological insight. Coupled with this is the resentment she still retains of Britain's treatment of anti-Nazi refugees. The book shortened a long train journey, but unhappily Miss Feiner tired of her problem, and brought the book to a sudden end. No one can believe that Alfie and Gladys would at one and the same time be so transformed as to live happily together.

THOSE SO-CALLED "GREAT" MEN

By the Rev. D. W. Langridge, M.A.

During the month of May commemorative notices appeared in the papers inviting public attention to the careers and services of certain eminent men of the past; of which great men the best known was Copernicus. This cultus, if we may so call it, of remembering and honouring great men is probably a more important matter, more important from the point of view of human progress—and especially of the direction of human progress—than perhaps some of us realize. It may be questioned whether in all cases the famous names we are taught to remember are really worthy of being remembered at all and whether, on the other hand, we ought not to disinter from ungrateful oblivion the forgotten names of others far more deserving of recollection. In these exciting days when we are engaged in actually making history, the plea for a sifting and analysing of the past, and more especially the proposal to revise the national roll of honour, may irritate some as being merely academic and wasteful of time. One's judgment on this will vary with one's degree of penetration and insight. I suggest that we can scarcely over-estimate the importance of discreetly choosing these types of human greatness which we hold up for admiration and presumably also for emulation, before successive generations of youth.

Children use and resent the epithet "copy-cat" as a term of abuse: it is, in fact, an epithet, homely indeed, but deeply and penetratingly true of us all. We are all copy-cats. The human race is supremely a race of copy-cats, and it is precisely because we are a race of copy-cats that we have so far excelled and outstripped all our rivals and competitors in the animal world. The immediate precursors of *homo sapiens* were endowed with remarkable aptitude for imitation, capacity for learning from others, and to this highly developed faculty many social psychologists, the late William McDougall amongst them, attribute the triumph of man over all his rivals. That aptitude remains. We are all exceedingly suggestible. By the power of suggestion most of us have been shaped into what we are in patriotism, education, politics, religion, and everything else; by suggestion, by unconscious imitation, copying, and not, as we like to suppose, by independent thought and reasoning things out, are we become what we are.

And of all mediums of suggestion, personality is easily the most

glamorous and hypnotic. An idea or a policy in the abstract may appeal to the few, but no sooner is that idea or that policy embodied in a living personality than its influence is multiplied a hundred-fold. The Word became flesh; that is the great open secret, primarily of the Incarnation but also of very much else as well. How much did the abstract idea of pacifism gain when it became actually embodied in the glamorous personality of Dick Sheppard? Many of us are incapable of grasping a long and abstract argument or too torpid to be aroused to enthusiasm by a principle, however noble. But we can all love and follow a person. Hence the enormous importance of rightly filling our pedestals and of Christianly choosing our heroes. We need not endorse every detail of Carlyle's doctrine that history is made up almost exclusively of the careers and influence of the few great and outstanding characters, yet when Browning declares that

> 'Tis in the advance of individual minds
> That the slow crowd must ground their expectation
> Eventually to follow,

most of us will agree, indeed we have to agree.

Of all the creative influences, then, working like leaven in human society the glamour of famous men is probably the greatest. It is accordingly seen to be a matter of primary importance what names shall be immortalized and what types of behaviour shall be indelibly impressed upon the minds of successive generations. And this is not, as one might suppose, something predetermined, a matter of destiny outside our power to shape and influence. It is in our power, and in our power today more than ever before; in our power if we choose to take trouble with it, to decide what eminent personages posterity should remember and to suppress and blot out the names of those whose example and influence might be voted malign. Government does already to some extent control the press and prescribe the curriculum. There is also a certain rough and working agreement as to what shall be allowed to appear in print. Prosecution follows the publication of gross indecencies, immoralities, and libels. It only requires a little further extension and a little more careful manipulation by consent of this agreed and salutary practice to effect the end we have in view. For example, it would be practicable, if we so desired, that the infamous name of Hitler should be suppressed and not handed down for the curiosity and possible corruption through attempted emulation of posterity. If a minor clause were inserted in the Treaty of Washington in 1945 to the effect that in Germany and in all other countries it should be illegal, an indictable offence, to make any reference to that name either in official compilations, school textbooks, lectures, radio, or anywhere else of a public nature, that name,

despite its present world-wide notoriety, would in a generation or two be forgotten by mankind.

Because nothing of this sort has been done in the past the names of great destroyers stand on a level with or possibly—forasmuch as at least initially vice has a higher publicity appeal than goodness—are even more widely known than those of humanity's great creators and saviours. Sir Patrick Hastings observed the other day that there have only been a few great men and they have generally been a nuisance. Well, why should we not remedy that as we remedy other nuisances? Everyone rattles off the names of Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon. These were in one sense great men, but forasmuch as their genius was military and their life work destruction it is arguable that on balance humanity would have profited had those names been suppressed rather than embodied in legend and had the magic of them not become an abiding and baleful light shining through history. If we really do desire posterity to take the ascending path, we should more carefully choose its signposts. We do well to praise famous men, but not woodenly to accept and bovinely to gloat over any old names that are handed down to us because our forefathers were too lazy or too corrupt to prune the roll of honour. And still less seemly would it be for us of this generation, dreaming our dreams of a warless world, a society of free and equal men in which there shall be neither opportunity for nor toleration of gangsters, to do the same disservice to our posterity.

This is a job in which, above all others, the Christian society should interest itself and exert its influence. We are far too prone to suppose that our duty as Christian men is simply to be good and kind, and we are too wretchedly averse from thinking down into the roots of things and seeking to purify the fountain of life at its source. It is true that the Christian society has its own roll of honour and holds up the saint as the type of great man most worthy of remembrance and imitation. But our public is limited compared with the general public, and we need to go further and try from this point of view a little to revise the teaching of history and the formation of tradition. And we of the Free Churches are especially culpable and more than others in need of enlightenment on this matter. We eschew altogether the keeping of saints' days; that is to say, we make no organized and systematic endeavour to see that the names and examples of great men, men at least who, living after Bible times, were great in Christ's sense of the word, are regularly brought to the notice even of our own people. How great would be the gain if regularly once every year on an agreed and appointed Sunday the names and achievements of, let us say, George Fox, John Wesley, Lord Shaftesbury, and David Living-

stone were vividly brought to our remembrance, thanks returned to Almighty God for all that they succeeded in doing, and their names, as the truly great, held up as a supreme example to the young.

The truth seems to be that so far the very idea of what we understand by *greatness* has not yet been baptized into Christ. If we are honest with ourselves most of us will have to admit that in our youth we have just tamely swallowed and complacently digested the general human tradition in these matters and have seldom, if ever, called a halt in our own minds and asked what on earth we as Christians are doing in blindly ascribing greatness to any chance captain or king we may have been taught about, however much of a buccaneer or bounder he may have been. And even in the case of our own contemporaries we still follow too sheepishly the crowd in ascribing honour or at least reputation to magnates and millionaires, politicians, film-ladies, pugilists, criminals, dictators, *etc.*, irrespective of moral worth or public usefulness.

The possibilities of the boycott, of rationing of applause and of withholding of patronage, have not yet been even inquired into, still less experimented with, by the children of light. But those possibilities might turn out to be considerable. There are six hundred million Christians, nearly one-third of the human total in the world. If that vast aggregate were all to take their religion seriously and seize every opportunity, they could influence very decisively world opinion. And especially in this present matter of hero-worship and the awarding of laurel leaves, if only we were wider awake how much could be done! If and when the public, or even a considerable section of it, were to practise a *hartal*, withhold its notice and applause, and exercise, in the matter of the newspapers it reads, the shows it attends, the radio it listens to, the books it buys, a conscientious boycott, even great heroes could soon be reduced to their true proportions and only the Christianly famous be approved and applauded.

And now, conscious from experience that even yet some may be totally unaware of what we are driving at, let us attempt to clarify the matter by citing an actual illustration.

We are told on good authority that here in England in the eighteenth century one person out of every ten died of smallpox. There was a certain medical man in the town of Berkeley who devoted himself to research into this disease. Despite much official discouragement at first, he persisted in his experiments, until ultimately he discovered the antidote and so delivered the human family from one at least of its greatest scourges. Today we seldom hear of a fatal case of smallpox. Edward Jenner

(1749-1823) was thus obviously one of the noblest benefactors of humanity in modern times; exhibiting withal a greatness of the Christian kind, greatness in redemptive activity, and in the deliverance of large numbers of his fellow-men from pain and death. But how many people have ever heard of him, and on what occasions is he held especially in honour, and what gratitude does he receive from us? There is perhaps, and necessarily, a certain clumsiness incident to comparisons of this kind, a difficulty in assessing the relative value to the world of services in different fields of endeavour. But making full allowance for that, can it be claimed that the achievements of, let us say, the Duke of Wellington were as valuable to mankind or his title to a grateful immortality as high as that of Edward Jenner?

I am well aware that all this may—to the spiritually stolid will—appear fanciful, but I also submit respectfully that whether we judge this to be merely a matter for the academic debate of the leisured or a matter of urgent importance upon which, if possible, action should be taken, depends upon the depth of our insight into the crisis through which humanity is at present passing and on the ardour and intensity of our resolve to break with the past, revolutionize our outlook and continue and plan a better future. How serious are we in all this? Roughly speaking, up till the present era in human history the order of things has been struggle and conquest, with the prizes and the honours going generally to the strongest, the cunningest, and the least scrupulous. The usual thing has been to poison your Socrateses, and to crucify your Christs, but to give kingdoms to your warriors, millions to your prize-fighters, and titles, honours, and estates to your successful destroyers. And the hierarchy of heroes handed down to us, accepted by us, and taught to our children roughly corresponds; the kings, the captains, the warriors, the wealthy, and the powerful are the types presumed successful and most to be admired. If we are in fact hoping to see quite a new and different order of things, a deep and difficult change-over must take place in our own minds, a change-over so radical that one doubts whether we who are over forty are really capable of it. And part, a large part, of this change-over is a revision of our standards, almost a reversal of our estimate, of who is great, a tremendous re-assorting of our applause. Deep down in innumerable minds there must be carried on this heavy spade-work, this Christian spade-work, before there can be sound and solid hopes of a new age.

Let us indeed praise famous men, but let us see to it that those we praise are deservedly famous; men and women famous for the right things, Christianly famous. What immediate steps towards this reformation can be taken I, an ordinary and uninfluential

commentator, naturally do not know; that is for educational authorities and denominational leaders to decide. There is, however, one thing which is within the power of each of us. It was J. S. Mill who said that mankind could never be reminded too often that there was once a man named Socrates. It is still more certain that none of us can be reminded or remind ourselves too often that there was once a man called Jesus. He was the king of saints, the noblest of human types, the light of the world; and it is impossible to have the example of His life before our minds too often.

Combined Operations, 1940-1942 (H.M.S.O., 1s.) is the well-illustrated account of the work of the Commandos. The "raid on Rommel", the attacks on the coast of Norway, the brilliant exploit of St. Nazaire, the storming of Diego Suarez, and Dieppe, are seen as leading up to the climax in the invasion of North Africa. As we read we are thrilled by the sight of human bravery, impressed by the improvement in co-operation between the Services, and disquieted by the number of times things went wrong: often it seems the old story of "for want of a nail the shoe was lost". It is too early yet to determine whether Dieppe was a costly failure or a necessary and valuable enterprise in which much knowledge was gained for future use. When the history of the War comes to be written, it will be revealing to compare it with contemporary accounts.

Mr. Gordon Bottomley introduces Miss Hsieh Ping-Ting's *The Autobiography of a Chinese Girl* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), translated by Tsui Chi, the pathetic story of an eager young rebel. Some readers will already know Miss Hsieh's *Letters from a Chinese Amazon*, which describes her life as a soldier. Here she tells of her determination to secure education, and to escape the marriage to which she had been destined from infancy. She was a girl of spirit, but had a mother whose obstinacy controlled a more tolerant father; after her army life Hsieh made many vain efforts to escape from home before her successful attempt. We call the book pathetic because of the writer's—and she represents many contemporaries—ingenuous belief in revolution, with its motto, "A revolutionary sheds blood not tears": its attitude is indicated in the sentences:

> A person belongs to society, he is no longer simply a devoted son to his parents. Time marches on, and society keeps advancing. The relation between father and son must not be allowed to hamper the welfare of humanity.

Dr. H. R. Williamson has given a life-time's work to China, and his *China among the Nations* (S.C.M., 6s.) is a useful book. It would have been more useful had it been two books—one dealing with the history and culture of China, the other with Dr. Williamson's own work. The two are jumbled together strangely in this survey, which leaves us asking for a book in which the writer has room to turn round.

Miss Joyce Reason's *Chiang-Kai-shek and the Unity of China* (Livingstone Press, 2s. 3d.) is a brief life of the Generalissimo. It is well told, but gives the impression of being a compilation from books. Had Miss Reason been able to talk with someone like George Shepherd, who has worked with the Chiang-Kai-sheks, her book would have greatly benefited.

"THE REV. THE FARMER'S BOY"

IMPRESSIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL VOLUNTEER CAMP, REIGATE, 1943.

By the Rev. EDWIN WHITE.

THE day's first sunshine greets me as I enter the camp. I am wet and have difficulty with my bicycle and case and rucksack. Then a man comes out of a tent and takes my case. He is my height and weight but much better-looking and a few years older. Well-dressed, too, in khaki shirt and jodphurs. He says his name is Michael Hobbs and he is the caterer in camp. That is rather a surprise: I had quickly catalogued him as either a "gentleman-farmer" or something "arty". "You'll be Mr. Anstead?" he asks. I say, "No, I'm White". "The Reverend Mr. White?" "Well, not particularly reverend while I am in camp", and he laughs and says that is all to the good.

My tent is the second of four in the southern of two lines. Before I arrive at it, Michael brings the Admiral along. He is taller and wears a roll-collar sweater and gum-boots. Until later, when I discover he is Admiral Sir Noel Lawrence, I wonder if "the Admiral" really is his title: he walks without a roll and does not bark instead of speaking. He helps me settle in. There are two beds already made in the tent; groundsheet, palliasse, and blankets. These should be five to a bed, but one here has nine. I notice the two beds have their heels pointing up the field's slight rise, so I make mine the other way round. My stable-companions may think me odd, but I like my head higher than my feet.

In comes Anstead, who is a very old friend of mine. We have managed to get a holiday together at last. We are glad to see each other and we say so. Then we do not know what to say, so we fall to wondering about our absent tent-mate. Bill thinks he must be honest, for he has left a gold-clipped fountain-pen sticking out of the pocket of a jacket on the centre tent-pole. When he comes in, which he does with a rush, Bill and I have a shock. The new-comer is about the longest person I have ever seen: six feet five, he tells us. His fair hair is in no sort of order. He wears an ex-white shirt, blue shorts barely adequate in girth, and muddy socks and shoes. I never manage to remember what his eyes are like, but his face is sunburnt and friendly. He peels off his shirt and goes to shave. When he comes back we exchange names. His is Sid.

Soon it is half-past six, and a ship's bell sounds for supper. We go to the mess-tent, which is about forty feet by twenty. Everyone has been working hard, and they are too tired and hungry to make introductions an ordeal. Bill, Sid, and I are joined at our table by a youngster named George. We all go to an asbestos-sheets and breeze-blocks "galley" and collect our own food. The two hot courses are excellently cooked, and tea is on a side-table. As the food goes down talk becomes more general and more lively. On some farms they have worked all day in the rain: others have been lucky enough to get a job in a barn, cleaning beetroot taken out of a clamp. They have all done a bit more of their holiday-work, and have all earned one shilling an hour.

There is plenty of hot water in the outdoor coppers, and we do our own washing-up in a zinc bath. I wish they had more than one tea-cloth, a wish I am to repeat every day I am in camp. Most of the equipment is marked "G.R.", and some has S.W.A.E.C., for "Surrey War Agricultural Executive Committee".

Sid has taken us under his wing and, having dressed more extensively, he takes Bill and me to "the pavilion". As we go up the field he explains that the house above the field has been taken over by an evacuated Assurance Company. The field is their sports-ground, but meadow-grass grows round the rugger and net-ball posts and the outdoor gymnasium. The pavilion is theirs also, but the campers may use it. I am shy in the presence of more than a dozen strangers. Most of them are playing darts or table-tennis. I sit on the floor and write letters on a chair. Then Sid and I talk. He is nineteen and accepted by the R.A.F. He hates aircraft but, since he must do something in the war, hopes to be a pilot. He sees I have *Paradise Lost* and talks literature. He hopes to make a living at writing later on, but at present writes a lot more than he gets published.

Bill has been playing table-tennis. George is championship class, but Bill has given him a good game. They want me to play. I hold back, saying I am no good. Sid says that will suit him, as he is a beginner. I beat him 21-10, 21-12, 21-7, and feel good. So I play a set with someone else. It is a good opportunity to explain I have only one eye; I want everyone to know at once, as that will save recurring embarrassments. At ten o'clock we have hot cocoa and go to bed.

I sleep well until the Admiral calls us at 6.45. I had almost forgotten such a time existed, but I feel the old thrill of camp, and dash, whistling, through the drenched grass to the ablutions tent. I wear only my shorts. In the tent I wash, cold, all over, and do some jerks on the way back. No one else washes so spartanly, but I am on my own ground here so I do not mind at all.

I add a shirt to my shorts and pile my bedding before the

breakfast-bell sounds. In the mess-tent, Bill picks up a newspaper that is lying on a table, then finds he has bought it, and has to pay a penny. Not much enthusiasm is shown for the papers. Porridge is followed by two kippers each person, and again the cooking is good. I have not lived like this for years, and it costs only twenty-eight shillings a week. I hope to earn more than that.

It has rained in the night, and the Admiral announces there will be no work today as the ground is not fit. The news is received with groans, and I realize again these people are real volunteer farm-workers, keen as can be on doing their holiday-bit.

Sid is going for a tramp: some others are shopping in Reigate, fifteen minutes' walk distant. Bill and I get our cycles and visit my grandmother at Nutfield. We ride the first three miles with George, who is going to drive a tractor at Bletchingley.

It is supper-time before we meet again. More table-tennis follows. I feel more at home: the cares of pastoral life are slipping away. I am a boy out of school. The Admiral says he can hear my shout, every time I win or lose a point, three hundred yards away.

Next day we work. We are hired out, in groups, to farmers in the district who want unskilled but willing help at a shilling an hour. I am sent with Scotty to an estate beyond Merstham. We leave camp at 8.15 and do the seven-mile ride in time to start at 9.0. It is a fine hot day. The head gardener puts us to our job: a big bit of garden has been ploughed, and the edges are rough. We are armed with dung-forks, handles four feet long, and four prongs on the business end. We turn over the great baulks of clay left by the plough: we bang them, shake them, worry them. Finally they are broken and the couch-grass and roots that held them together are teased out and piled. Then we level the ground and move on. It is hard work. Sometimes I have nearly a hundredweight on my fork. The sun burns down. Soon I am working in my singlet and shorts. Scotty is interesting. Forty-five years ago he was in the old *Worcester* with the Admiral. Since then he has been in Canada and America. He has a host of stories and tells me some, partly to slow me down, as he thinks I am going too fast. He is right, too. I am doing my usual desperate speed, not realizing how much physical energy I am using on this unusual task. We have a break at 11.0, and I sleep for ten of the fifteen minutes, stretched out on the ground. At 1.0 we have our sandwiches, and Mrs. Manning, the gardener's wife, brings us a big pot of tea. We are enormously grateful.

We work again from 2.0 till 5.0. Then I go on ahead, as Scotty cycles slowly, and I want to buy some sunburn lotion on the way to camp. But when I get to Redhill all the shops are closed.

At camp I lose my tiredness and feel quite swallowed-up in the good companionship. Bill is staggering slightly when I meet him, and says he has never worked so hard in his life, but within an hour he, too, is dancing about with a table-tennis bat in his hand. For the first time I have something to do with the girls in camp. I play with or against Irene, who is tall and good-looking and wears grey corduroy slacks, and her friend Maureen, a very nice girl, the quieter of the pair. Also the other "inseparables", Pat, aged twenty-three, attractive but a bit scatter-brained, and Celia, older, though not much, and married and as steady as a rock. They are a great quartet, young and healthy and keen. Pretty good scenery, too.

It is amazing how quickly the excitement and fun give way to serious talk. I had hoped, as much for the others' sakes as my own, to keep my profession a secret, but Sid has seen my name on the Admiral's file, and the Admiral calls me "Padre", so it is all over the camp now. Nearly everyone wants to talk religion. One night, as we go to bed, Sid asks a question about religion. We talk until after one in the morning. Another night we are joined by George, who squats on the grass near our heads, and the talk lasts nearly as long. Sid knows as little about religion as most educated young men of his age. George knows more but believes less. Another night it is six of us in the mess-tent. Pat and Celia sit on a table while George and Peter, the camp orderly, lie full-length on two others. Someone else sits on a chair, and I lean against a tent-pole. It is years since I felt so truly a minister of the Gospel or found such sincerity in religious inquiry.

Scotty and I have finished our sod-breaking and are cutting nettles. We start under a south wall where figs, plums, apples, and pears are growing. The sun hits us direct on one side, and, bouncing off the wall, fries us on the other. For all his years Scotty can stand the sun better than I. The nettles are five or even seven feet high, and as we cut them with our reaping-hooks they fall on our hands and arms. We are stung again and again from elbow to finger-tips, but it does not seem to matter after the first few stings. Mr. Manning comes to see us twice a day. I know he does it to give us an extra break. I find it hard to talk to him at these times: I do not want him to feel I am trying to prolong our rest. Scotty is still trying to make me go slow, and he and the heat are succeeding. I can feel this queer holiday is doing me good: my mind is easing-up: I am achieving an inner relaxation even when I am working outwardly.

Days are going by. We have cut millions of nettles and it has not been at all a bad job, although I have four painful blisters on my hand. A nurse comes each evening to see about blisters and other ills. I make an awful *faux pas*. I have just finished bathing

when someone puts his head in the ablutions tent and shouts "Anyone want to see the Nurse?" Without thinking I say, "Is she pretty?" and am horrified when a feminine voice, perfectly audible through the canvas walls, answers, "No, not particularly"! I hasten out, towel in hand, to apologize. She forgivingly dabs calomine lotion on my sunburnt back, but the others chaff me a lot.

The campers have done a variety of jobs. Mostly it is weeding, hoeing, or planting cabbages. The farms vary, too, but on the whole they are good and everyone is happy. On Thursday an official of the War Agricultural Committee comes from Guildford to lecture us. He takes us roughly through the farm-year. Then we shoot questions at him. Sid is interested. He says it is his aim, as a writer, to be interested in everything. I argue that I can only manage a certain number of interests and agriculture is not one of them. But one realizes what a multi-expert the good farmer is.

The week-end brings a change in personnel. Sid goes to a camp in Gloucestershire; Bill and most of the others go back to their work. George, Pat, and Celia are semi-permanent. The newcomers seem an odd bunch at first. I am now a veteran and enjoy telling the rookies how to go on. They are mostly quite new to camp and seem to appreciate hints on how to be comfortable. I am enjoying camp no end, and I am afraid I swank a bit, especially on the gymnasium, when I discover I alone of all the men can climb a rope. Michael, by the way, now calls me "Father". The first time he did it I answered with, "Yes, my son?" and he was bitterly disappointed. He says calling a Nonconformist minister "Father" is supposed to make him angry.

Scotty has gone to another farm, and I have a new colleague. Ronnie is a laboratory assistant in a factory, and we are weeding fruit. It is easier than nettle-cutting, but not so interesting.

The weather seems to have broken. For two days we have been idle. I shall go home tomorrow. Meanwhile Michael is not well and has left camp for a day or two. The Admiral and Peter and the cooks, with some help from George, are managing extremely well: the camp goes on, efficient, very informal, and tremendously cheerful. I have never spent a happier holiday. I feel it has done me more good than most past ones. I feel fine. Fine, too, to know that this camp, during the eleven days of my stay, has supplied nearly six hundred work-hours towards England's harvest.

ON THINKING

By the Rev. LESLIE J. TIZARD. B.A., B.D., B.Litt.

"To think well is to serve God in the interior court."
—*Thomas Traherne.*

IT must now be clear even to the dullest minds that we shall be confronted after the war with national and international problems of the utmost complexity, which will call for bold and resolute action. We are not likely to take the right course unless action has been preceded by a great deal of hard thinking not only by our leaders but also by us who make up the rank and file. That means for many of us a determined effort to overcome our unwillingness to think at all. In a book written soon after the war began Sir Norman Angell observed that, for ten people who could be persuaded to think about the causes of war and the means of its prevention, ten thousand could be induced without much trouble to take an interest in the war itself once it had started. He draws the not altogether unreasonable conclusion that people would rather be killed than think! But when we have got the better of our mental inertia we have to face up to the very difficult business of mastering the art of thinking, for no amount of mental effort will ever lead us to truth (except accidentally!) if we have never learned *how* to think. It seems to me, therefore, that, before we begin the consideration of any specific problems and before we try to ascertain the facts about anything, we should remind ourselves of some of the difficulties of objective thinking, of some of the pitfalls into which the unwary may stumble, and (to mix the metaphors a little) of some of the blinkers which human minds habitually wear. No doubt that convenient individual, "the man in the street", supposes that he always thinks clearly, objectively, and without passion or prejudice, and that he always bases his conclusions on sufficient evidence. The trained mind knows that unbiased thinking is difficult and that the price of clear thinking, like liberty, is eternal vigilance. We must cultivate the habit of watching our own minds at work and of pulling ourselves up immediately we fall into prejudiced, confused thinking. Some of us, perhaps, would have had a bad time had we chanced to meet Socrates, intent on making us explain exactly what we mean by the words we use, on convincing us that we do not know on adequate grounds nearly as much as we think we do, and compelling us at any cost to be intellectually honest. Well, Socrates, like Christ, was such a nuisance to the prejudiced and the people with closed minds that they put him out of the way. They had to if they wanted any

peace. J. B. S. Haldane wrote an essay on certain scientific experiments which he entitled "On being one's own rabbit". I might have called this article "On being one's own Socrates".

Some of us perhaps want to say outright that to think without any trace of passion or prejudice is humanly impossible. That, I think, is probably true. It is also true that by subjecting our minds to rigid training and discipline we could approach much nearer to the ideal than actually we do. We cannot excuse ourselves from being as good as we can on the ground that we cannot be perfect. Perhaps we cannot reach that state of intellectual detachment when prejudices (some with their roots away back in childhood), self-interest, complexes buried in the unconscious, emotions, and so forth will have lost all power to warp our judgment. But it is a point gained when we frankly recognize that they may do so and keep an unsleeping watch against them at the door of the mind.

So let us glance at some of the things which distort judgment and cause us to accept conclusions which we could not justify at the bar of impartial reason. I shall not deal much with the fallacies familiar to some of us years ago in the textbooks of formal logic but rather with the mental attitude which conduces to clear thinking and sound judgment.

(1) The effect of emotion on thought.

The old Faculty Psychologists used to divide mind into three functions—intellect, feeling, and will. According to their view the thinking part of us worked in a water-tight compartment, and there was no leakage into it from the other division which housed the emotions. From some points of view that would be very convenient if it were true; but it certainly is not. There is no such natural division of functions. Emotion can be excluded from reason only by the most rigorous mental discipline, and never is the separation complete once we get outside the realms of pure science and mathematics. André Maurois (who has a useful chapter on thinking in his book *The Art of Living*) quotes Pascal to the effect that if geometry stirred us emotionally as much as politics we should not be able to expound it so well. Not even can scientists always achieve detachment when expounding their own subject. There are certainly some psychologists, for example, who cannot think of Freud without emotional revulsion, and there are some Freudians who cannot think of other schools without passion or prejudice. There is no such reasoning faculty naturally distinct from the rest of the mind. As Prof. Laura Stebbing observes: "We do not think with a part of ourself. Our thinking involves our whole personality. *How* I think is conditioned by the kind of person I am, whosoever 'I' may stand for".

Let us get it firmly in our minds, then, that although it is difficult to exclude emotion from thought, to the extent that we allow reason to be influenced by feeling, we lessen our chances of arriving at the objective truth concerning the problems—social, national, and international—which confront thinking people in these days. I do not, of course, suggest for a moment that emotion has not a very useful part to play in relation to these problems. Why does a man who gives his life to secure better conditions of housing or labour, or a fairer distribution of wealth, wear himself out with the advocacy of his cause? Assuming his motives to be genuinely disinterested, it is because he has been emotionally stirred. He has experienced, or he has seen, what bad housing and grinding poverty can do to the personalities of men, women, and children. He is stirred to pity or to indignation. Emotion provides the initial driving power which sets him thinking, but, if he is going to deal with the problem usefully, he must put his emotions into cold storage while he examines coolly and impartially the causes and cure of the evil. Abraham Lincoln in the slave market was roused to compassion and anger, and said, "If ever I get the chance to hit this thing I will hit it hard". But the weight of his blow depended on his examining without sentimentality, hate, or anger the whole question of slavery. That done, and sound conclusions reached, emotion can come into its own again and provide the driving power which will enable a man to put his carefully thought-out solution into action, and hold him to his purpose even through loss and persecution. Adam Bede was speaking sound sense when he said, "It isn't notions sets people doing the right things—it's feelings".

It is not difficult to find examples of the way in which emotion perverts and even overthrows reason entirely. Think how, in other days, military pomp and the glorification of war made straight thinking on the subject difficult for many a peace-loving citizen. Here is a poem by Richard le Gallienne which sums it all up:

War I abhor; and yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street
Of drum and fife. And I forget
Wet eyes of widows, and forget
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchery without a soul.

Without a soul—save this bright drink
Of heady music, sweet as death;
And even my peace-abiding feet
Go marching with the marching street.

For yonder, yonder, goes the fife,
And what care I for human life?

The tears fill my astonished eyes
And my full heart is like to break;
And yet 'tis all embannered lies,
A dream those little drummers make.

O, it is wickedness to clothe
Yon hideous grinning thing, that stalks
Hidden in music, like a queen
That in a garden of glory walks,
Till good men love the thing they loathe!

Art! thou hast many infamies,
But not an infamy like this,
O snap the fife and still the drum,
And show the monster as he is!

You will recognize the truth embodied in that poem. We cannot think clearly about anything until we strip off the emotional trappings and see the monster as he is. (That, by the way, is a point on which Marcus Aurelius likes to insist—that we should always see things as they are.)

There is, however, something else to be said about that poem. While it may be all very well as a poem and contains a valuable truth, it is not good as an argument because, while protesting against the devastating effect of emotion on reason, it does so in language itself surcharged with emotion. It is fatal to cool argument once you begin to talk about "wet eyes of widows" and "broken old mothers". Of course, poetry is one thing and argument is another, and in reasoning, at all events, we shall do well whenever possible to eschew all emotionally coloured words. There are scores of words which have acquired an emotional tone —Nazi, Boche (have you ever tried to analyse how many emotions Mr. Churchill expresses in those words?), Bolshevism, reactionary, die-hard, revolutionary, capitalist, proletariat, sex, sexual, obscurantist, and so on. Of course we cannot always avoid using them, but for purposes of cool reasoning we must be careful to minimize their emotional significance. When one man talks about "bloated plutocrats" and the other retorts with something about "Bolshies" the sequel may be interesting to the student of Billingsgate technique but will give scant satisfaction to the seeker for objective truth.

I take two further instances from that gold-mine of samples of perverted thinking, *This England,* published annually by *The New Statesman.* So from a *Times* leader: "No doubt there are mitigating circumstances in British eyes . . . in the reflection that Nazism, as a form of Government, is, after all, a domestic preference and has no mission (as Bolshevism has) to export its system to other countries". There is no mistaking the emotional colouring

of the word "Bolshevism." Better still this from Sir Oswald Mosley: "Over the whole of this Abyssinian dispute rises the stink of oil and stronger than the stink of oil is the stink of Jews". That one sentence would effectively foreclose the possibility of cool argument. He could have said the same thing in language that would not have produced such emotional reactions. He deliberately chose instead the speech of the propagandist who seeks to arouse feelings. When feeling comes in at the door reason flies out at the window.

(2) Evidence.

If we are to think usefully we must be careful what we accept as evidence. Thomas Huxley used to speak of "the fanaticism of veracity". There are many fanatics in the world, but unfortunately few of that particular brand. Huxley also made the challenging statement that the assertion which goes beyond the evidence is not only a blunder but a crime. I am not sure that Huxley's own fanaticism of veracity did not here carry him a little too far. We have no business to assert anything in the absence of a reasonable amount of evidence or in the presence of proved facts to the contrary; we have no right to claim perfect certainty while an element of doubt remains. But absolutely complete and unchallengeable evidence for many things is perhaps unattainable. We are not thereby excluded from believing them if the balance of probability seems to our cool judgment to point that way.

Since both our experience and our capacity are strictly limited we must accept much of our evidence at second hand. We are bound to rely on experts, and since the experts will often not agree among themselves, we are compelled to discriminate between them. We must be sure the man whose word we accept really is an expert, for "what the soldier said is not evidence", and, contrary to the popular superstition, not everything which appears in the newspapers or in print bears the hall-mark of authority!

We should remember, moreover, that because a man is an expert on one subject he is not therefore entitled to be regarded as an expert on all. Because a man is a first class astronomer his opinions on economics or religion are not necessarily of more value than the next man's. These are days of intensive specialization, and, as someone has remarked, a specialist is one who knows more and more about less and less. I am sometimes led to doubt whether certain publicists and popular pundits, who pose as experts on everything and whose words have the force of oracles with multitudes of blindly adoring readers, are really entitled to be regarded as authorities on anything at all.

Finally, in this connection, let us remember that we are not entitled to reject a man's authority in his own field because we do

not approve of his opinions or character. In his *Legends of Smokeover* L. P. Jacks says of a specialist:

> In private life he is an avowed atheist, a reputed loose-liver, a user of foul language, and intolerably vulgar in his manners. Professionally he is a mystic, a Puritan. He never begins an operation on the brain or the spinal cord without invoking the Divine blessing on the knife and compelling his assistants to join him in prayer.

You may not think much of him as a man, but he may be better qualified than anyone else to give you an opinion on your spinal cord. There is no doubt that our personal likes and dislikes are apt to affect our valuation of a man's evidence and even determine to whom we will or will not listen. The devil may be the father of lies, but if he should happen, even by accident, to say something true, it would not be less true because *he* said it.

(3) Over-simplification.

We must be on our guard against attempting in one way or another to make our thinking easy by over-simplifying our problem. It was said of a certain famous general that he was dangerous because he had the gift of making a situation appear simpler than God intended it to be. Few problems in these days are likely to be simple, and we shall do well to remind ourselves of some of the dangerous ways in which we may be tempted to over-simplify them.

(a) We may be tempted to select only the evidence which supports the point of view we want to establish, ignoring whatever would militate against our preconceived ideas. Darwin set it on record that he kept a note-book in which he jotted down all facts or ideas which were opposed to his own conclusions because otherwise he forgot them.

(b) There is what Dr. Thouless describes as "tabloid-making" and Prof. Stebbing calls "potted thinking". It consists of an attempt to sum up a complicated matter in a phrase or formula which leaves out of account all qualifications, distinctions, and uncertainties. Dr. Thouless points out that tabloid thinking, coined into slogans and so on, may be useful for action but is not conducive to straight thinking. As examples of tabloid-thinking he gives the summing up of all Freud's teaching in the words "Everything is sex", or of Darwin's in "Men are descended from monkeys". That kind of thinking is dangerous, for it certainly makes the situation clearer than God intended it to be, and than Freud or Darwin saw it to be. I heard a man heatedly asserting the other day that "All Germans are beasts—all the lot of them". That was a shocking example of potted thinking which, incidentally, broke several other canons of straight thinking as well.

(c) Sometimes we may be tempted to maintain an extreme position which is easier to defend than a more moderate one. It might call for much more courage or sacrifice to put that extreme course into action, but, so long as we can remain securely in the realm of abstract thought, it may simplify the situation to go all out on one side or another rather than be forced to argue the pros and cons of a difficult and complicated compromise. Of course, some people are possessed of a peculiar "cussedness" which will lead them to take up an extreme position on any question. Others, if they were honest, might have to admit that they enjoy the sense of adventure in posing as an extremist and also the mild notoriety or distinction which it seems to give them, though when the time came to pass from theory to action they might not prove to be the stuff of which martyrs are made.

On the other hand, some people have a horror of anything which looks like an extreme position. They believe the truth must always lie somewhere in the middle and therefore are predisposed to accept whatever looks like a compromise simply because it is a compromise. So, to quote Dr. Thouless again, people of the most diverse opinions present their views to us as intermediate between two extremes:

> A liberal canvasser comes to us and points out that the conservatives represent one extreme in politics and that the socialists represent the other, while the liberal party steers a moderate course between these two extremes. We feel, as moderate men, that we must support the liberal party. This faith is a little shaken when the conservative canvasser calls and points out that the conservative ideal of constitutional liberty is midway between the radicalism of the progressive parties and the tyranny of fascism. We are still further shaken when the labour canvasser urges us to support a party that steers a mean direction between the capitalist parties on the one hand and revolutionary communism on the other. Finally, perhaps, we find ourselves at a communist meeting where the speaker points out (quite truly) that the communist programme avoids on the one hand the extreme position of the capitalist parties and the bourgeois socialists and, on the other hand, that of the anarchists who deny the necessity for any organised government at all.

(4) Prejudice and Thought-habits.

Habits of thought are formed in very early childhood and are largely the result of upbringing. But early training may have either a positive or negative effect upon us. A child who has had a very strict and intensive religious education may grow up unusually devout, or in reaction he may conceive a violent dislike of religion and be unable to think of it without passion or prejudice.

A child whose father is a staunch conservative may become an ultra-conservative himself or in reaction he may become a revolutionary or an anarchist. Of course, the son may thus swing away from his father's most cherished views not because he has coolly examined and rejected them, but because he thus finds a way of expressing a repressed hostility to his father. In such things, apparently so far removed from our present problems, we must undoubtedly seek the origins of many of our adult prejudices. And Adler has contended that a child's felt inferiorities, his position in the family and so on, largely determine the lines on which his mind will run in approaching life's problems. Thought habits, like other habits, are difficult to break once they are deeply entrenched, but we must recognize their existence and allow for the subtle ways in which they may warp our judgment.

Again, prejudices may arise from the fact that we belong to a certain nation. A Dutchman, Dr. G. J. Renier, has written an illuminating book called *The English: are they human?* One of his chapters he entitles "The Best in the World". He says:

> Apart from a relatively small minority, the English are convinced that they are, that they own, and that they produce, all that is best in the world. As the late Earl of Birkenhead has put it, they feel, almost to a man, that they lead the world in matters of moment. . . . Let me be allowed to present to my readers a little random anthology of judgments by the English people about themselves. It makes no claim to completeness. It would be possible to collect, in one year, enough utterances of the same kind to fill a volume of the Catalogue of the British Museum.

Then, true to his promise, he goes on to give an amazing collection of extracts from newspapers and speeches in which almost everything English is claimed to be "the best in the world". He concludes the chapter with some remarks on the nature of patriotism. The most natural expression of patriotism is, he says, the slogan, "My country right or wrong". Only when it reaches the highest form of which it is capable does patriotism shed this battle-cry and embrace the nobler ideal which generates the endeavour to make one's country so noble and lofty that it will really only do and wish to do the things that are right. But to the English no such endeavour appears necessary, and so they have merely modified the primitive slogan and made it into: "My nation, ever right". The conception precludes the notion that lessons can be learned abroad, even if it does not altogether stifle the invigorating conviction that there is room for improvement. Well, there is no denying that this type of God's Englishman does exist, and, bursting with national prejudice, holds with complete conviction that everything English is in very truth the best in the world and that

all foreigners are either knaves or fools. There is, of course, the opposite type who believes that everything in another country is superior to anything in his own. Though national prejudices are a factor always to be reckoned with, it is comforting to remember that racial antipathies are not instinctive even between black and white. Small children will play happily together regardless of colour until they are infected with the prejudices of grown-ups which have been fostered by various forms of rivalry and self-interest.

Even more powerful, perhaps, is class prejudice, which makes a man ready to believe nothing but evil of another class and nothing but good of his own. This is often fostered by a system of education which segregates the classes and prevents mutual understanding and appreciation. It is inevitable that our thinking on many subjects should be coloured by our membership of a certain section of society unless we are capable of more than the usual degree of objectivity. There is truth in this passage from George Orwell's *The Road to Wigan Pier*—a book which contains a good deal of useful material on the subject of class prejudice:

> The fact that has got to be faced is that to abolish class-distinctions means abolishing a part of yourself. Here am I, a typical member of the middle class. It is easy for me to say that I want to get rid of class-distinctions, but nearly everything I think and do is a result of class-distinctions. All my notions—notions of good and evil, of pleasant and unpleasant, of funny and serious, of ugly and beautiful—are essentially *middle-class* notions; my taste in food and books and clothes, my sense of honour, my table manners, my turns of speech, my accent, even the characteristic movements of my body, are the products of a special kind of upbringing and a special niche about half-way up the social hierarchy.

And there is party prejudice, which makes a man believe implicitly in his party's programme and divine right without any intelligent criticism, while he readily believes the other side capable of any villainy without asking for evidence. This sort of bias is delightfully illustrated by a quotation from a *Daily Mail* article given in *This England:*

> What should the British attitude be? This can best be decided by noting what the Soviet would have this country do and taking the opposite course[1].

Nor must we forget prejudice against an individual. Certain people are apt, we say, to get our backs up, and then we do not give cool and impartial consideration to their opinions.

(5) "Wishful Thinking" and Rationalization.

We all have a tendency to believe what we want to believe and to disbelieve what we find inconvenient or uncomfortable. How

[1] This, of course, was written before the war.

easily the rumour about the Russians passing through England was believed in the dark days of the last war! How quickly reports of a crack somewhere in Hitler's system would be snapped up now, since that would offer most hope of a shortened war! How easily many people can believe something which would be to their personal advantage. But we do not like to admit, even to ourselves, that we believe anything without good and sufficient reasons, so these subtly deceptive minds of ours will "rationalize" our beliefs or our actions—that is to say, they will construct reasons in plenty, but, though they may sound well enough, they will not be the reasons which actually determine our belief or our action. Bernard Hart, in *The Psychology of Insanity,* tells of a young man who suddenly gave up his Sunday School teaching on the ground that he had ceased to believe, for which change of mind he could give plenty of intellectual reasons. But the real reason was that he had been jilted by a fellow-teacher. Sir Philip Gibbs quotes a medical man who refers to the divergent economic professions of certain of his rich patients. One proclaims his faith—"his almost religious faith"—in tariffs and quotas. "That is because he is afraid of competition in his own line of business". Another, who is head of a shipping firm, proclaims his faith in Free Trade. "They are not aware", shrewdly observes the doctor, "that their pockets are the place from which their convictions arise". And doubtless the one could give plenty of arguments for tariffs and the other for Free Trade without any conscious insincerity, and without the least suspicion that if they were in each other's shoes they would just reverse their arguments. There is a little rhyme which helps us to see how ridiculous rationalization can become:

Now Dives daily feasted
And was gorgeously arrayed;
Not at all because he liked it,
But because 'twas good for trade.
That the poor might have more calico,
He clothed himself with silk;
And surfeited himself on cream
That they might have more milk.
And e'en to show his sympathy
For the deserving poor
He did no useful work himself
That they might do the more.

The abolition of slavery, the education of the poor, and most other social advances have been opposed by people who rationalized their self-interest, as much as the huntsman who assures you that "the fox likes it".

If we want to be sincere truth-seekers we have to resolve before

we consider specific problems that the prospect of personal gain or loss of wealth, position, or prestige will not influence our judgment of any solution proposed for a problem in which our self-interest is directly or indirectly involved. Further, as rationalization is an unconscious process, we must not take umbrage if somebody bluntly points out to us that we *are* rationalizing.

(6) Suggestion.

We must be on our guard against the power of suggestion. Suggestibility is the willingness to accept, as true, ideas which are repeated with sufficient frequency and impressiveness, without subjecting them to independent criticism and without asking for conclusive evidence to support them. The degree of suggestibility varies in different individuals according to temperament and education and in the same individuals with changes in health or circumstances. Suggestion has, of course, its legitimate uses, but it is misused by religious revivalists, advertisers, journalists, statesmen, and above all by Ministries of Propaganda.

Obviously suggestibility is closely linked with the herd instinct. As Trotter has told us, "*Anything* may be believed provided it is suggested by the herd". When such beliefs appear to conflict with reason they are rationalized, in order that the harmony of the mind may not be disturbed. The rationalization may or may not be justified, but the existence of the beliefs themselves has nothing whatever to do with objective truth—it is simply the result of the sensitiveness of the mind of the gregarious animal to herd suggestion.

The fact is that most people dislike being different from the herd. They do not like to look odd or to think in any way which would mark them off from their fellows. Further, many people have the vague and inarticulated feeling that the majority is probably right—not necessarily the majority of the whole nation but the majority of the set or stratum of society with which they have personal contact. Dr. Inge has observed that the

> declaration of war against society is profoundly unwelcome to most of us, because we have been deluded by the absurd catchword that the voice of the people is the voice of God, which it never has been since the voice of the people cried "Crucify Him, crucify Him", and never will be.

The man who would think objectively must be prepared to hold views which differ from those of his own immediate circle. He must be ready to find himself in a minority, remembering that a thing is not less true because only one man says it. Galileo was right when he alone believed that the earth moved, and the fact that everybody now admits it does not make him any more right. Moreover, the man who finds himself in a minority should

remember that the number of people qualified by independent thought and serious study to hold any view of a given issue will be small in proportion to the number who loudly and confidently express their opinions. "The hope of the world", as someone has said, "is in its minorities".

(7) Perspective.

We must try in all our thinking to preserve a proper sense of perspective. So many people lack just that, like the boy who murdered his parents in order to qualify for the orphans' picnic. Clear thinking depends on the ability to seize on what is vital and to distinguish it from the mass of unimportant details with which it is entangled and the side-issues which cling to it like barnacles. How often conferences, lay and ecclesiastical, discussion groups and the like, waste their time on trivial issues, having apparently failed entirely to discern the major problems and to set them in true perspective. A popular newspaper has to provide a daily sensation, and if there isn't one ready to hand it must create one, otherwise it will not remain popular. The man of real insight is he who can pick out the event which is likely to prove important in the long run, though the newspapers may have relegated it to a back page on the following morning.

We must remember also that there is a tendency to allow the thing which happens near home, or which affects our own little private world, to loom much larger in our thoughts than events of infinitely more significance which seem remote because they take place on the other side of the world or affect directly a different stratum of society. It is, I suppose, inevitable that what happens to *me* should seem of the utmost moment, but if I want to think objectively I must discipline myself to remember that it is of no more importance than what happens to the other fellow.

(8) Logic and Practice.

Finally, though we have determined that we will do our utmost to think rationally, we must remember that we are dealing with a real world. We are not playing an intellectual game of chess in which we can reason out the next move, shift our piece, and know that it will stay put. There is always a danger when men, who set out to be rational thinkers or idealists, discuss the problems of the world from the depths of arm-chairs. As John Buchan has said: "The drawback to a completely rational mind is that it is apt to assume that what is flawless in logic is therefore practicable". We may soar into the realm of reason and idealism, but, if we do not keep some contact with the solid earth, we may find the ground unexpectedly hard and unyielding when our wings give out and we come down to it again.

A VINDICATION OF THE PURITANS

By the Rev. Horton Davies, M.A., B.D., D.Phil.

When a caricature passes for truth among the descendants of the misrepresented, a new and more accurate portrait is called for. Our ancestors, the Puritans, have been grotesquely misrepresented by the malicious pen of Macaulay. He depicted them as fanatical Philistines, utterly antagonistic to the arts. The classic caricature is contained in the following passage of the *History of England:*

> It was a sin to touch the virginals. . . . The solemn peal of the organ was superstitious. The light music of Ben Jonson's masques was dissolute. Half the paintings in England were idolatrous, the other half indecent. The extreme Puritan was at once known from other men by his gait, his garb, his lank hair, the sour solemnity of his face, the upturned whites of his eyes, the nasal twang with which he spoke, and, above all, by his peculiar dialect.

If the description were simply meretricious, it would not be worth the tribute of a refutation. It is the half-truth in the description which constitutes its danger. Macaulay's mistake is that he has taken the exceptional for the characteristic features of the Puritan. His Puritan might have walked on to the Elizabethan stage, but surely such a Puritan never strode through the Westminster Assembly. Macaulay's Puritan existed only in his imagination, as did Malvolio in Shakespeare's, or Zeal-of-the-land Busy in Jonson's. The historian sees no kinship between the caricature of Macaulay and the personalities of John Hampden, John Milton, John Owen, and Oliver Cromwell. They, too, it may be argued, were exceptions; but they were the chief of the Puritans and in them the Puritan genius came to its fullest fruition.

In one respect, namely, in their attitude towards music, the Puritans have been triumphantly vindicated by Dr. Percy Scholes[1] from the charges of Macaulay. Dr. Scholes shows conclusively that the Puritans were not the tone-deaf fanatics of Macaulay's caricature. He shows that although they objected to ecclesiastical music, other than the Psalms, private music was encouraged in their midst. It would be superfluous, if not impudent, to attempt to cover the same ground again. It would not, however, be out of place to estimate the Puritan attitude to ecclesiastical art and ecclesiastical music.

On a superficial judgment it appears that the Puritans were colour-blind, because of the extreme bareness and simplicity of

[1] *The Puritans and Music* (1934).

their worship. A High Churchman, accustomed to the ancient ritual and splendidly magnificent vestments and ornaments of the Established Church, would regard Puritan meeting-houses and Puritan worship as ugly and naked. John Donne, the Dean of St. Paul's, for instance, describes[2] the Puritan Crantz as one who

> loves her onely, who at Geneva is call'd'
> Religion, plain, simple, sullen, yong,
> Contemptuous, yet unhansome.

The simplicity of Puritan worship and of Puritan architecture was not, however, due to a failure to appreciate beauty. Nor was it due to an inordinate fear of beauty as a snare to entrap the senses of man. The simplicity of Puritan art and architecture can be accounted for on purely theological grounds. It was the result, not of an insensitivity to beauty, but of obedience, as they believed, to the will of God.

In the first place, the Puritans aimed at restoring the primitive and unadorned simplicity of the Apostolic Church. The clergy of the Established Church might defend their retention of the vestments of the medieval Church on the ground of "comeliness", but the Puritan answered that God must be worshipped as He had commanded, and the perfect model of acceptable worship was the simplicity of the early Church. To worship God in other ways than He had commanded, however they might commend themselves to men, was to court the Divine displeasure. A certain Mr. Axton was haled before the Bishop of Lichfield at the end of the sixteenth century for refusing to wear the surplice. The Bishop insisted that "it is comely in the Church of God". Axton replied[3]:

> What comelynesse is it for the minister of God to wear the raggs of Antichrist? But if it be comely, then the velvet and Golden Coapes by that reason are more comely. But this is not the comelinesse of the Gospell. . . .

It was by the same Word of God, the Scriptures, that the Puritans condemned all ecclesiastical traditions which found no warrant in the Bible. It seemed to them that the second commandment, which prohibited "graven images" of God, necessarily demanded the removal of any representations of the Divine Majesty on glass or wood or stone. This, of itself, accounts for the absence of stained-glass windows in the Puritan meeting-house.

It might be pointed out that the second commandment by no means prohibits the representation of the Virgin Mary or of the Apostles or saints. How then are we to account for the ferocious zeal with which William Dowsing, the chief of the Puritan iconoclasts, destroyed such representations in the churches of Cambridgeshire? Doubtless they were removed by the Puritans

[2] Satyre III, lines 50-52.
[3] *The Seconde Parte of a Register* (*c.* 1593), 40; Peel's *Calendar*, I. 68 ff.

as a potential danger to the "weaker brother". They were, it must be remembered, the monuments of an older religion—"the badges of Antichrist". It was feared that the retention of them might revive the abuses they brought to memory; for they bore testimony to the medieval prayers offered to the Virgin and the saints. The Apostle's injunction "to avoid the appearance of evil" was the motive of Dowsing's mentors.

It may be urged that whilst it was expedient to remove the memorials of the older faith in the days of the Commonwealth, yet in later days, when the fear of a revival of abuses had diminished, the Nonconformists made no attempt to improve either their worship or their meeting houses. They were still as bare as barns a century later. This, however, was the product of impecuniousness. The impoverished Dissenters were unable to afford lavish ecclesiastical edifices, even if they had desired to build them.

A second reason for the simplicity of Puritan worship and Puritan architecture was due to the fact that the Puritans had never valued their church buildings as the Anglicans esteemed theirs. If the clergy of the Establishment thought of the "Church" as an edifice, the Puritans meant by the "Church" the people of God. The difference in attitude towards buildings for public worship is seen in a comparison of Hooker, the leading Anglican apologist, with Gillespie, a Scottish Presbyterian of distinction. For Hooker the Church is a sacred building; for Gillespie the sanctity rests in the "saints", under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Hooker writes[4]:

> The very Majesty and holiness of the place where God is worshipped, hath in regard of us great virtue, force and efficacy, for that it serveth as a sensible help to stir up devotion; and, in that respect, no doubt, bettereth even our holiest and best actions in this kind.

Compare Gillespie[5]:

> . . . unto us Christians no land is strange, no ground unholy; every coast is Jewry, every house Sion; and every faithful company, yea every faithful body a Temple to serve God in . . . whereas the presence of Christ among two or three gathered together in his Name (Matthew xviii. 20) maketh any place a church, even as the presence of a King with his attendants maketh any place a court.

This conviction that God "dwelleth not in temples made with hands" rendered the construction of religious edifices among the Puritans as utilitarian as possible.

In the third place, ceremonial and elaborate furnishings were superfluous to the Puritans. They did not need such stimuli for

[4] Hanbury's *Hooker*, II, 41.

[5] *Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies*, Edn. of 1660, p. 123.

the imagination. As Shakespeare relied on few artificial aids as spurs to the imagination of his audience, substituting the transcendental imagery of his verse for the fictitious aids of scenery and properties; so the Puritans rejected the ecclesiastical "scenery" of the medieval Church for the symbolism and imagery of the Bible. The mental scenery and symbolism of the Divine drama recorded in the Bible provided a more vivid backcloth to their faith and worship than human manufactures in stone or glass or wood could do. This is excellently expressed by the late Bernard Manning[6]:

> To call on the name of God, to claim the presence of the Son of God, if men truly know and mean what they are doing, is in itself an act so tremendous and so full of comfort that any sensuous heightening of the effect is not so much a painting of the lily as a varnishing of the sunlight.

The Puritans did not despise beauty, but only the misuse of it in the perpetuation of error. Moreover, the ancient meeting-houses that are still extant are characterized often by dignity, simplicity, and elegant proportions. It is perhaps in New England rather than in this country that the Puritan tradition in architecture has received just recognition—if imitation be the sincerest form of appreciation[7].

The Puritan attitude to music was not dissimilar. The more extreme Puritans regarded music as a carnal snare, it must be admitted. As, for example, a certain John Mulliner who counted music well lost if religious peace of mind were gained instead. "I have been so troubled", he writes[8],

> that I have laid my instrument down, and have reasoned with myself after this manner, and fell a crying to God, it is true I love this musick, but what good can these sounds do me when my soul wants Peace with God; and this doth but stir up Laughter and Lightness of Spirit, to make me forget my Maker and this will last but a little while, and I had better seek my peace with God, and then, At his Right Hand are pleasures for evermore; and these thoughts I had then so that my Musick began to be a Burden to me.

This attitude was not, however, shared by the more cultured Puritans. The more representative viewpoint is that of John Cotton, who declares[9] that, although instrumental music is banned in the worship of the church, "Nor do we forbid the private use of any instrument of musick therewithal". Indeed, as Dr. Percy Scholes has shown, the Puritans encouraged private music.

There was good reason for their objection to elaborate

[6] In *Christian Worship* (ed. N. Micklem).
[7] *Cf.* Dr. Andrew Drummond, *The Church Architecture of Protestantism*, 60-64.
[8] *A Testimony against Periwigs and Periwig-Making* (1667).
[9] *Singing Psalms a Gospel-Ordinance.*

ecclesiastical music. In the first place, they were convinced that such music was essentially a distraction. They rejected it because it did not edify the congregation. In the second place, the very intricacy and complexity of the music of the Established Church made it impossible for the common people to join the choir in singing their common praises to God.

Robert Browne, in this connection, refers scathingly to the antiphonal singing of the psalms by the two sides of a cathedral choir. His objection is not aesthetic, however, but theological. He describes it thus[10]:

> Their tossing to and fro of psalmes and sentences is like tenisse plaie, whereto God is called to Judg who can do best and be most gallant in his worship; as bie organs, solfaing, pricksong chanting, bussing and mumling verie roundlie, on divers handes. Thus thei have a shew of religion, but in deed thei turne it to gaming, and plaie mockholidaie with the worship of God.

The simplicity of Puritan worship and architecture was not due to any failure of sensibility. The Puritans were neither colour-blind nor tone deaf. Iconoclasts, as some of them were, they were not Philistines or apostles of gloom. Their aim was not to destroy "whatsoever things are lovely", but to uproot all idolatrous practices that they might serve the living God "in the beauty of holiness". If beauty was forced to abdicate from their churches, she was accorded a coronation in their homes. The Puritans objected to Sunday dancing, to the use of instrumental music in the worship of the church; and to representations of the Trinity and the Saints in their meeting-houses. But it is not to be inferred from this that they banished dancing, music, and art from the Commonwealth. Dancing was encouraged by Cromwell, celebrated by Milton in *L'Allegro*, and played an essential part in the education of Colonel Hutchinson's family. Indeed, it was at the height of the Puritan regime that Playford published his *English Dancing Master*. As to the private encouragement of music, it will suffice to remember that "Opera, so far as Britain is concerned, was actually an importation of Puritan times[11]". The existence of Puritan portraits is a proof that secular art was encouraged.

For the Puritans the arts were not the handmaids of the Church because they had been the mistresses of Rome. For that reason they could be the servants of the home, but not the servants of the Church. It was not that the Puritans disliked art, but that they loved religion more.

[10] Percy A. Scholes, *The Puritans and Music*, 195.
[11] *Ibid.*

PLACARDING THE CROSS

THE THEOLOGY OF P. T. FORSYTH.

By the Rev. ALFRED E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., D.Th.

I (1) "O senseless Galatians, who has bewitched you, you who have had Jesus Christ the Crucified *placarded* ('written in public', 'proclaimed') before your eyes" (*Gal.* 3[1], Moffatt). There are no other words which I can think of which can so pregnantly and pungently characterize the theology of Forsyth as regards matter, method, and manner[1]: (a) Whatever subject he may be dealing with we are never allowed for long to escape the vision of Jesus Christ the Crucified, the one *matter* that matters. The Cross itself is often personified, and we might even say deified in describing the passion or the action of Christ or God in Christ. (b) It is always being set before us with such intensity of conviction, urgency of appeal, confidence of statement, that the word *placarded* is the appropriate metaphor for his *method.* He uses lavishly all the abundant resources of his gifts of nature and gains of culture to advertise, "writ large"—the Atoning Sacrifice. His method has led some of his readers to charge his style of composition with obscurity. His light sometimes dazzles. (c) The apostle's address to his readers: "O senseless Galatians" might, *mutatis mutandis,* be transferred to him as regards his *manner.* He is ever reproaching and rebuking churches for allowing the spell of any other doctrine to hold them; and on scholars and thinkers, to whom the Cross is not, as it was to him, "the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation", his severe and even scornful censure is poured. While he by his controversial manner evoked the admiration and gratitude of those who welcomed his defence of the evangelical faith, he provoked the irritation and antagonism of those whose "liberalism" he was assailing; and both fell into the same mistake in regarding him as *reactionary* in theology.

(2) All who understood and appreciated him, and desire to share with others the treasure he brought to them, must feel deeply indebted to his daughter, Mrs. Jessie Forsyth Andrews, for the admirable brief *Memoir,* which she has prefixed to the reprint in 1938 of his book on *The Work of Christ,* first published in 1910, the book with which those who want to study his writings should begin.

[1] I have read the article on "The Authority of the Cross" in the *Congregational Quarterly,* July, with great interest; but the date is earlier than that of the literature on which my exposition rests, and I have found no modifications necessary, but have made some allusions.

In presenting with due reserve his personal relations she there shows a side of his personality, the more tender and kindly, that supplements what his writings disclose, and thus gives us the means of better knowing and valuing her father. (a) She gives the reason for his dominant interest in the Cross by a quotation from his *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* which discloses that he passed from a "liberal" to an "evangelical" theology by an inward crisis. It was in this "crucial" change that the intense and constant conviction of *The Cruciality of the Cross* (the title of a book published in 1909) was rooted. (b) An attempt, such as is here being made, to interpret this central doctrine of his theology seems the more necessary inasmuch as his writings have been neglected because of his *obscurity* of style, the difficulty which even competent readers have found in understanding him: so noted a theologian as Robert Mackintosh confesses uncertainty[2] "regarding Dr. Forsyth's exact meaning". To this charge he was sensitive, and does not deny it; but he meets it by stating[3] that he has

> kept in view rather students than readers—those who do not resent an unfamiliar word, who are attracted rather than impatient towards a dark saying, who find the hard texts the mighty ones.

Elsewhere (p. 296) he justifies his indulgence in antithesis, epigram, and paradox. He insists on the mental discipline necessary to the competent theologian who must often be unintelligible to the man in the street. His daughter offers this defence. After maintaining that the verdicts on his style "fall into contradictory groups", she claims[4] that "the real stumbling-block" is the "idiom of his mind". This is only partially true, for although, familiar as I am with his writings, and intimate as it was my privilege to be for many years in personal relations, I find no difficulty, yet I can quite understand why others experience it; it was "the idiom of his mind" over which many readers stumbled. He "lived and moved, and had his being" in a region of doctrine, rooted as we have seen in experience, which has become "a region beyond" not only the intelligence, but even more the conscience, of "liberal" theologians. They do not, it may be they cannot, recognize the necessity of atonement by judgment on sin in the Cross for the mutual reconciliation of God and man. There I am wholly with Forsyth and agree with him that this essential element "seems to be absent" from Mackintosh's "very able and fine essay", although I should hesitate about making this doctrine the test of a "falling" or a "rising" Church, as he does. His daughter offers us an explanation of such *obscurity* as he himself admits, in describing his mode of

[2] *Congregational Quarterly,* XXI. 212.
[3] *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* vii.
[4] *Op. cit.*

composition: the physical strain of the mental stress "driven by the Holy Spirit" under which he wrote "after an hour or two left him exhausted". In his emotional intensity he indulged in an exuberance of style, a tropical luxuriance in language. Although he revised again and again, he did not prune enough. He had one of the quickest minds I have ever met, and it is not surprising that slower minds cannot always keep pace with him. (c) His controversial tone has offended many, and even his friends must admit that he might have been more convincing had he exercised more restraint in the expression of the acute repugnance he felt to the type of theology that had once held him in thrall. It is the obverse, as was the apostle's, of his passionate devotion to his Saviour and Lord and of compassionate concern for those who might be led astray. His daughter assures us that he did not love strife for its own sake, but that he detested it, and that it caused him nervous exhaustion. When necessity was laid upon him, however, he was "a bonnie fechter", and even gave the impression that he enjoyed the clash of arms. His daughter quotes the testimony of her husband, H. T. Andrews, who was one of his colleagues:

> For him the Cross was everything, "his work, his reality, his eternal life". Apart from the historic act of redemption there was nothing in Christianity that counted for much with him. He used all the weapons in the prophet's armour to confound his opponents. People thought sometimes that some of his blows were too hard, but he felt he was fighting for the very life of the faith, and that he had no option but to contend to the uttermost for his soul's convictions. The new spirit of evangelism in the Church today was made possible by the prophetic work of Forsyth, and when the answering revival comes, it will be the harvest of his life's work.

As a friend and colleague of both I heartily endorse this judgment; but I must add that the redeeming, reconciling, and atoning grace of Christ and His Cross was still being preached by more men than Forsyth acknowledged; and there were other pioneers of this evangelism in theology who would gladly accord the foremost place to him. (d) The assumption that Forsyth was a *reactionary* in theology here demands further consideration. In his opposition to nineteenth century "sentimental heterodoxy" (the false conception of God's Fatherhood) and to twentieth century "critical heresy" (the religious-historical school of theology) he did not return to eigtheenth century "rigid orthodoxy" as its champion, to use his own generalizations[5]. He was not a *reactionary* in the sense of *retreat* from the perils of the new ways to the shelter of the old paths, but a *reactionary* in the alternative sense to which

[5] *Faith, Freedom and the Future*, 171. He distinguished heterodoxy as a misinterpretation from heresy as a denial of the Gospel.

he himself calls attention, that he reacted, sometimes uncritically, to much that he found in those new ways by *return* to the Apostolic Gospel, as he understood it, in so far as it had been preserved in the old paths[6]. Had he not used the term "liberal" as a reproach[7], a current usage which I much regret, I should have described him as a *liberal evangelical,* the label I attach to myself when necessary. He was evangelical, but not fundamentalist or traditionalist; he was also modern, but not modernist. He was a *progressive reactionary,* to indulge in paradox, as he often did. He rejected the theory of verbal or plenary inspiration of the Bible, and accepted the modern method of literary and historical criticism, but he assigned to the Scriptures a *sacramental* function as containing and conveying the Word of God, and as having a regulative authority in Christian theology. Not only did he not accept, but he exposed the limitations of the Ancient Creeds, and the defects that had dominated the Patristic, the Medieval, and the Reformation periods in regard to the doctrine of the Cross. He was also careful to exclude from his own exposition erroneous statements which have survived in more recent evangelical representations, *e.g.,* the Cross is not a sacrifice offered by man to God, but God's own self-sacrifice for the salvation of men; Christ was not punished, nor held guilty by God, nor regarded Himself as guilty instead of sinful mankind; but he did, as we shall see, admit a sense, not, however, that of the Reformers, in which the sufferings might be described as substitutionary and penal. He was often so exclusive in his *grasp* of the one doctrine of the Cross that he was not comprehensive enough in his *reach* to other doctrines. He did not give an unreserved assent to Robert Mackintosh's in my judgment true contention that "the Synoptic teaching of our Lord and the Pauline doctrine are the two great formative influences in *N.T.* teaching". A survey of his teaching such as I have made with care, but cannot here reproduce, proves conclusively that he was *progressive* in his theology generally. His stress on the need of authority is so limited to the one *dogma,* as we shall see, that he cannot be charged with a relapse towards Catholicism of any type.

II. Within the necessary limits of an article I cannot treat of his theology as a whole, but must confine myself to the one doctrine to which he attached exclusive importance. (1) "The *badge* of the Church", he says[8], "may be a theological confession, a symbol more or less elaborate, but the *bond* or essence of the Church is religious", *i.e.,* a dogma. Given such a dogma as the fixed centre of thought and life, he recognizes different types of doctrine as explications of it as legitimate, and would allow theology even

[6] *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ,* 26. [7] *Positive Preaching,* 209.
[8] *Theology in Church and State,* 27.

greater freedom in the preparation of doctrine. He attempts (pp. 28-29) to formulate this essential dogma:

> God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son *to be a propitiation for us,* that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

It is interesting to note that while in his exposition he depreciates the emphasis in current theology on the love of God, and lays all the stress on the holiness, he here is compelled to correct his own bias. While he necessarily recognizes *redemption* from sin and *reconciliation* with God as affected by the Cross of Christ, what he always desired to keep in the forefront was *propitiation,* not as man propitiating God, but as God propitiating Himself, showing Himself *propitiatory* (*Rom.* 3^{25}), satisfying His own holiness by judgment on the sin which in His grace He forgives. Forsyth makes this clear in the fuller formulation:

> God hath given us the ministry of reconciliation which is, that God was in Christ reconciling the world, not imputing their trespasses unto them. For (*to meet the conscience that resents its easy forgiveness*) He has made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him (*2 Cor.* $5^{18, 19, 21}$).

The second sentence may be thus paraphrased to bring out its meaning. God did not regard Jesus as guilty, but He treated Him as a sinner, *i.e.,* the consequences of sin, penalty for sinners, were experienced by Him in obedience to God's will in identifying Himself with sinful mankind, so that men whom God knows to be guilty might be treated as righteous, and being so treated might become righteous. While I have never been able to escape from the *objective* doctrine of the atonement, the necessity of the vindication of God's righteousness (Forsyth uses the term holiness) in the communication of His grace in forgiveness, for "my conscience resents its easy forgiveness"; yet Forsyth seems to me here unduly to narrow the purpose of God's love in the gift of the Son. He bases his dogma not less, if not more, on apostolic authority than on Christian experience. As regards *James,* he "commended Luther's attitude to the Epistle", would not exclude it from the canon, but regarded it "as unreconciled with Paul but not irreconcilable", yet in *The Cruciality of the Cross* he assumes that James did not "abjure the Pauline method".

(2) In presenting his theological exposition, I shall, I venture to think, best serve the interests of readers by trying to reduce the *kaleidoscopic* variety in his writings to one comprehensive statement in as plain language as I can command and the subject itself will allow. (i) "The ethical is the ontological". "Morality is of the nature of things". The ultimate, essential and final reality is the "Holy Father". In morality what alone matters for man is

redemption from the power, the guilt, and the doom of sin by *reconciliation* with God. As this is a personal relation, it is mutual. Not only do men need to be reconciled to God by the change of misbelief, distrust, and disobedience to belief, trust, and obedience, but God also needs to be changed, not as regards His eternal disposition as Father towards all mankind, or His eternal purpose of salvation for "mankind sinners" by His own sacrifice, but as regards His temporal attitude of favour to mankind in justification, *i.e.*, in Christ sinners who receive in faith His grace are regarded and treated as righteous, and become so. For redemption as for reconciliation, the *atoning death on the Cross was necessary*. This is the crux of Forsyth's doctrine, and must be given in his own words[9]:

> God could not trifle with His own holiness. He could will nothing against His holy nature, and He could not abolish the judgment bound up with it. Nothing in the compass of the divine nature could enable Him to abolish a moral law, the law of holiness [for that] holy law is His own holy nature.

I entirely agree, but should emphasize more than Forsyth does that it is *love* that wills redemption and reconciliation, while it is *holiness* that requires the means towards this end, if we may so distinguish. God's love commands our confidence and reverence only as it is holy. For conscience the vindication of God's holiness in atonement is inseparable from the satisfaction of His love in redemption and reconciliation. If penitence and faith are to be evoked God's judgment on sin must be conveyed as well as His forgiveness. The moral effect on man depends on the moral content for God. (I do not think Forsyth would have disclaimed my expansion of his thought here.) I have used his term *holiness*, although I myself see no gain in departing from the term used in the New Testament, *i.e.*, righteousness. Whether he was justified in this change of terms will be discussed at a later stage.

(ii) In his last book, *This Life and the Next*, the third chapter has this daring title, "The Egoism of God". As God is not an individual, but the universal reality from whom all individual existence derives, He alone can be *by*, *in*, and *for* Himself (the terms *aseity*, *inseity*, *proseity* mean this). God alone determines His own existence, character, purpose. God justifies Himself to Himself in justifying sinners as He does in Christ on the Cross. "He does owe something to that closed self which blesses all to their fill". Forsyth disowns the Protestant doctrine of the atonement by penal substitution, the concentration in the agony and desolation of "the pains of hell for ever", but, inasmuch as Jesus so identified Himself with sinful mankind as to share the consequences of sin as God's judgment on sin, in some sense, He

[9] *The Work of Christ*, 112-113.

became man's *substitute*, and these consequences were *penal*. In enduring these consequences in holy obedience He approved God's judgment. "He felt sin with God and sin's judgment with man". In His submission He for mankind said "Amen", and made "the adequate confession: 'Thou art Holy as Thou judgest'[10]". While Forsyth insists on the *necessity* of this experience of Jesus on the Cross, he does not make intelligible the *possibility* of the sinless thus sharing the consequences of sin as judgment.

(iii) There is one feature of his exposition that is most welcome to me: the emphasis on the *finality* and *universality* of the work of the Christ. "He died once for all": there is nothing can or need be added to it, for there is nothing lacking in it. It is *finished work* and embraces all mankind. The atonement is complete; mankind is redeemed from sin, and reconciled to God. We live in a saved and not a damned world, but redemption and reconciliation, the already perfect gift of the grace of God, need to be individually accepted by faith: it is the God already reconciled who is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, "Jesus did it all: all to Him I owe", but if I continue in sin I am still under law. May I add what, as far as I can remember, Forsyth never explicitly states? If the Cross is the temporal passion and action of God to reveal His eternal disposition and fulfil His eternal purpose, its efficacy and sufficiency must be not only *prospective* but *retrospective*. Divine grace from the beginning anticipated human sin, and made provision for its judgment and forgiveness. Greatly daring, we may modify the words of the apostle. If in the historical appearance there was a "passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God" (*Rom.* 3^{25}), in the eternal reality there was already grace and forgiveness in God's dealing with men, for the Lamb "was slain from the foundation of the world" (*Rev.* 13^{8}). Forsyth affirms the eternal sacrifice but does not draw this inference from it.

III. I have, I trust, already given sufficient evidence of my appreciation of, and gratitude for, the invaluable contribution Forsyth made to Christian truth and faith in "placarding the Cross", as he did with such passionate conviction and constraining urgency at a time when religious thoughts were being diverted from the centre of the Christian Gospel, to ward off any charge of undue criticism if I now state frankly the reserves I must in sincerity and candour make in my substantial agreement with his doctrine of the Cross. In commending the truth which he taught I cannot shirk the duty of warning against some of the errors into which he fell. I cannot here argue my case as fully as I should like, but must try as briefly as possible to state the limitations and defects of his

[10] *The Cruciality of the Cross*, 212-215.

treatment of the subject. (1) What I miss is an adequate approach to the "glorious mystery" through the history of the Jewish nation and the personal experience of Jesus. For in his absorption in, and concentration on, one aspect of the Cross Forsyth has left much obscure that needed explanation, and the illumination of which would have made the mystery more and not less glorious. The Cross has universal and permanent value for mankind, for it is a revelation of the character and purpose of the eternal God; but the Crucifixion itself has a local and temporal significance. While the action and passion of the transcendent God may be described as supra-historical, yet as also immanent in time, the Cross is historical, an event and an experience, and the causes of the event and the reasons for the experience need to be explored to give the death of Jesus even as atoning sacrifice its full significance. It was not sin in general nor judgment in general that was the apocalypse of evil which so overwhelmed the spirit of Jesus as to evoke the cry of dereliction; it was the sin of the Jewish people and their rulers in rejecting Him, and in thus refusing its own destiny as the missionary, and if need be the martyr, nation (*Isa.* 53); it was the doom which it was incurring in the fall of Jerusalem and the break-up of the nation which He foresaw and foretold weeping that gave the concrete content to His experience of God's judgment on man's sin. That God's chosen people should reject the promised Messiah, and in Him its appointed destiny, and that in so doing man should turn the best to the worst, God's offer of the supreme good to occasion of extreme evil—that was sin's ultimate exposure and condemnation. How this tragic event became the heart-breaking experience of Jesus needs examination also; how could the Holy so identify Himself with sin and its consequences as to endure such dereliction as the veiling of the Father's face (one must here speak in metaphor, and not definition), as the recipient of God's judgment as well as agent of God's grace, condemning sin in saving sinners. The theological interpretation which Forsyth gives needs to be more firmly based on this national history and this personal experience. The vicarious sacrifice was an inflicted martyrdom and a defiant crime, and all these aspects of the Cross should be considered in seeking to penetrate as far as our vision can into this "glorious mystery".

(2) Antitheses were not only a too frequent mark of Forsyth's style, but to think in contrasts was an "idiom of his mind", with the result that the *whole* truth was sometimes sacrificed in the assertion of a *part*. In his aversion to some current modes of theology or religion his appreciation of one truth was expressed in his depreciation of another. To give the three instances which most distressed me, he contrasted the Holiness with the Love of God, the Cross with the Ministry of Jesus, the Godward with the

manward aspect of the sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross. (i) Because of his aversion from the sentimental conception of the love of God as Father as good-nature, never severe, but always kind, he, instead of expounding the New Testament conception of love in the distinctive words *agape* and *philia*, often sets love and holiness in opposition to one another. He admits that holiness is more an Old Testament than a New Testament idea, yet uses it instead of the New Testament word righteousness and so seems to me to alter its meaning. The term Holy Father occurs only in *John* 17^{11}, as a plea for the sanctification of the disciples, as does the term "righteous Father" in 17^{25} "as a reason for their reward". The word holiness is used of God in *Heb.* 12^{10}—"that we may be partakers of His holiness". The Spirit is Holy as sanctifying, setting apart for God, separating from the sinful world. I think an examination of all the uses of the word in the *N.T.* would justify the conclusion that Forsyth has departed from its distinctive meaning. I cannot here further discuss the matter, but I venture to express my own conception of the divine attributes in an alliteration which may help the memory, Holiness is the self-preserving, Righteousness is the self-protecting, and Love the self-projecting perfection of God. God keeps and guards and gives His perfection; and there is no schism in His eternal nature.

(ii) This opposition of holiness to love leads to the contrast between the Cross and the Ministry of Jesus. Here again his reaction from the current tendency to limit the revelation of God to the teaching and example of the "historical Jesus" provokes him to a depreciation of the value of the ministry which for me borders on irreverence. To give an instance from the last *Congregational Quarterly*, the teaching of Jesus "failed of the effect that he genuinely hoped for from the outset, the attention and conversion of Israel", as it might not, had it been more like that of Paul. Was He mistaken in giving it? Should He have preached the Cross—the doctrine before the event? That too was to the Jews "a stumbling-block" (*1 Cor.* 1^{23}). There are a few passages where he redresses the balance; but only too often he gives the impression that Jesus was born only that He might die, that the sole significance of the Incarnation lay in the Sacrifice, and that the truth and grace men beheld in the Word as flesh while He tabernacled among men (*John* 1^{14}) shed their radiance on the darkness of the world only on Calvary. It is true that Jesus did see the fulfilment of His vocation in His sacrifice, but the ministry was the necessary and congruous preparation of Himself, His disciples, and the people for that end. What He revealed of the Fatherhood of God in the realization of His Sonship disclosed the truth about God and man without the knowledge of which the Cross

would have been a meaningless tragedy. Forsyth's judgment is not to be trusted when he is dealing with the ministry in such antitheses; his absorption in the Cross made him insensitive and unresponsive to the truth and grace which it disclosed. He depreciated any attempt to understand the inner life of Jesus, especially His relation as Son to God as Father, although in one so sincere in conscience, so consistent in character, as Jesus was, the outer life was so transparent that the inner shone through it, and sometimes there were frank and full disclosures. Unless we have come to know the Father in the Son we cannot interpret the mutual relation of Father and Son in the event and the experience of the Cross.

(iii) It is because holiness is contrasted with love, and the Cross with the Ministry, that we have a third contrast in the concern of Jesus on the Cross with God and with man, which seems to me unwarranted as a *dogmatic* imposition on, and not a psychological or historical exposition. If we have not the data for knowing the intimate relation of Father and Son, what evidence is there for the assertion, to give only one instance[11]: "Jesus was more engrossed with the will of God than the needs of men in his last hours"? We may agree that the relation of Christ to God must be primary, and to man secondary, yet His love for God need not be contrasted with His love for man. His self-renunciation was for man's sake as well as for God's. His action had a bearing on man no less than on God. In His absorption with God He was not oblivious of man. He was, in doing God's will, and showing His love in His obedience, concerned with man's salvation from sin as well as with the vindication of God's holiness in judgment. He so identified Himself with mankind in compassion that He shared the consequences of sin, and He so identified Himself in obedience with God that in accepting these He approved God's judgment. The record of the Sorrowful Way and the last hours testifies to His love for man and God. The assumption that Jesus on the Cross was acting on God is inconsistent with Forsyth's own insistence that the Cross is not man's sacrifice to God, but God's sacrifice for man, and that what was effected on the Cross was no change in God's disposition or purpose, but only in His treatment as righteous of sinners, who in faith receive the grace of Christ in His Cross. I have offered these criticisms reluctantly, but as there are welcome signs of a revival of interest in Forsyth's theology it is necessary that the limitations and defects should be recorded by way of a warning, as well as his excellences be "placarded" as a commendation. As one who loved and honoured him I have written this article as an expression of sincere appreciation and cordial gratitude.

[11] *Congregational Quarterly*, XXI, 216.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

TRAINING FOR POST-WAR REHABILITATION.

In this country it has been widely realized that work in post-war rehabilitation abroad will be an avenue of Christian service which will call for trained personnel, and sundry groups are endeavouring to fit themselves to respond to the call.

In the United States a lead has been taken by three Divinity Schools on the Pacific Coast—the Pacific School of Religion, the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, and the Starr King School, all situated in Berkeley, California. The Scheme is set out in the document here printed. [Editor.]

The Need.

Trained Christian workers will be needed for post-war rehabilitation. Various agencies of the churches, as well as of government, are now maturing plans for sending a considerable number of qualified workers to Europe and Asia as soon as hostilities cease.

With many of the major spiritual blights in areas over which the shadow of war has swept back and forth, governments will be able to concern themselves at most indirectly and incidentally. There will be the problem of the recovery of the capacity and courage to trust people again. There will be the conversion of emotions of revenge into constructive channels of community rebuilding. There will be the revival of the sheer will and grit to live and take up life again. There will be the restoration of family life. There will be the incorporation of uprooted and vagrant individuals into wholesome groups. There will be religious institutions that need strengthening. There will be the establishment of colony schools on the land for orphans and the setting up of work camps for dislocated and unemployed youth. For these and many other spiritual as well as material problems of personal rehabilitation and community rebuilding the co-operation and collaboration of private agencies will be desperately needed.

Personnel.

As occupied and belligerent areas are opened up and order restored, famine and epidemics brought under control, the way will be open for variously trained and well-balanced men and women to carry on this work of personal and community service. Theirs will be, in most cases, an informal ministry, detached from the regular institutions of religion. These workers will have to be persons of courage, sensitivity, patience, creative

imagination, hope and faith, for they will be dealing with frustrated, hating, insecure and lonely people, adults as well as boys and girls. They must be able to get along easily with people and know how to get things done. They must be proficient in various skills and crafts as instruments for their spiritual ministry, for the areas to which they go will be depleted of resources and temporarily of leadership. In view of the tragic character of the situations they will constantly face they must be well-grounded in the resources and habits of religion and an understanding of its power.

Training.

To delay the training of qualified workers until the need and demand for them shall suddenly become imperative is to forfeit the right of religious and humanitarian idealism to its place of leadership in a time of emergency.

The three neighbouring seminaries in Berkeley, California, have, therefore, arranged a special intensive Programme intended primarily to train short-term emergency workers. The Programme will not in any way interfere with the regular curricula of the three divinity schools, which will continue their long-range education of theological students for the parish ministry, the chaplaincy and for educational administration. All the resources of the participating divinity schools, however, will be made available for the special Programme of Training. The Programme is made possible by a grant from the Columbia Foundation of San Francisco and by gifts from individuals.

The Programme calls for the co-ordination of a variety of teaching resources and other leadership so richly available in the San Francisco Bay Area. The University of California, whose campus is adjacent to the co-operating divinity schools, provides a wide range of pertinent courses and instructors. The Programme will also, at need, draw upon the nearby College of Chinese Studies and the extension divisions of the local boards of education. Large use will be made of persons who have had first-hand experience of rehabilitation. These specialists will place their vivid and concrete knowledge of particular phases of the work at the disposal of the students in training.

Regions.

Students will be trained for work in one region in Europe and one in the Orient. The particular areas will be determined, prior to the opening of the academic year, after consultations with sending agencies and boards. The predominant interests and needs of the matriculating students will also be taken into account in selecting the areas for which training will be provided.

Qualifications.

The Programme of Training will be open to individual men and women as well as to married couples who in addition to a college degree or its equivalent have physical endurance, emotional stability and spiritual imagination. A small number of special students will be admitted. It is expected that the student body will be composed of theological students, men and women just graduated from college, ministers, prospective or furloughed missionaries, social workers, and other laymen and laywomen.

Curriculum.

The curriculum will cover four major fields of interest: (1) courses for the understanding of the region to which the worker will go, its culture, *mores*, history, dominant ideologies, local forms of religion; (2) courses in principles and methods of personal and community rehabilitation; the

operation of enterprises for rehabilitation; skills for the implementing of this spiritual ministry; (3) language courses to enable intercommunication to take place; (4) courses designed to strengthen the religious resources of the worker, avoiding all sectarianism.

A sample curriculum has been arranged with adequate provision for flexibility to meet the needs of students with different degrees of preparation and maturity, as well as the desires of sending agencies. The participating divinity schools are free to modify the curriculum in the interests of their constituencies. (For a sample curriculum, subject to modification, see below.)

Every student will be expected, on week ends, during the greater part of the year, to engage in some kind of relevant field work, such as work camps, control of juvenile delinquency, interracial projects, social work, *etc.*

The year of basic training is divided into six periods of eight weeks each, a total of forty-eight weeks, with approximately sixteen to eighteen hours of class work a week. Credit toward theological degrees will be arranged in terms of each individual student's situation. If, at the end of the year, the students cannot yet be sent abroad they may, if they desire, take further work in language, special skills and field experience.

Tuition and Costs.

The tuition for the year's basic training is $300, which includes a registration fee of $10. Tuition for a single period, $60; for a single course, $20; but admission to less than the full year's work requires special permission of the Director. For men the cost of room and board will amount to approximately $350; for women, and such men as cannot be accommodated in the dormitories, perhaps $150 more. These figures, however, cannot take into account possible rises in the cost of living. A limited number of scholarships is available through the generosity of the Agnes Wilson Osborne World Fellowship Fund and the gifts of several individuals. Lack of funds, therefore, need not discourage qualified persons from applying for admission.

The course will begin on September 6, 1943, and conclude on August 25, 1944.

Sample Programme for Post-War Rehabilitation Training.

First Period (September 6-October 29).—Regional Study: history; geography (physical and human); racial and ethnic groupings. Personal Rehabilitation: process and principles of psychological and spiritual reconditioning of persons suffering from shock, despair, depression, hatred and personal disorganization resulting from the war experience; techniques of interviewing and counselling. Faith for Living: the insights and resources of the Old Testament. Language.

Second Period (November 1-December 24).—Regional Study: local institutions and *mores;* municipal governments, laws; school system and education; family life; community life; women's organizations; business, shops and industry; social work and services. Personal Rehabilitation: problems and procedures in the vocational, educational, social and domestic rehabilitation of individuals; therapeutic values and use of group work, handicraft, recreation, personal hygiene, etc., in personal reconstruction. Faith for Living: the insights and resources of the New Testament. Language.

Third Period (January 3-February 26).—Regional Study: national organization and institutions; government; economic organization; postal and communications system; legal system; social security; character and effect of Axis control and administration of area. Resources and Methods

of Religion for Rehabilitation: process of evoking religious faith, insights and ideals at the point of despair; private and group meditation and prayer; use of religious literature for devotional readings; Christian techniques in conflict situations; embodiment and communication of the power of religious faith through personal and social living and through movements for social rehabilitation. Faith for Living: the witness and experience of the Church through the centuries. Language.

Fourth Period (March 6-April 28).—Regional Study: religions and religious institutions of the area. Administration of Field Operations: general principles and procedures in restoration of community life; survey of local fields and procedures for determining projects; securing local support and leadership (Government and private) for projects; methods of control and direction of activities (authoritarian and democratic); international law governing refugees; international agencies engaged in relief and rehabilitation (their functions and principles of operation). Faith for Living: a philosophy of ultimate reality and of supreme values, a theology for today. Language.

Fifth Period (May 1-June 24).—Regional Study: political and social ideologies of the area and of the Axis. Organization of Field Operations: specific group enterprises; neighbourhood councils; colony schools; work camps; craft factories and workshops; producers' and consumers' co-operatives; playgrounds; public health and sanitation; festivals and fairs; housing; camps and homes for migrants and evacuees; women's organizations. Skills and Techniques (to be selected from list below): pedagogical techniques; nursing; child care; dramatics, games, dances, singing and music. Language.

Sixth Period (July 1-August 25).—International Relations: and programmes of political and social reconstruction. Skills and Techniques (examples from which students may select): housing; community planning; agricultural skills; auto repair and operation; mechanics, woodwork; metal and leather work; securing safe water supply; money exchange; printing and newspaper work; publicity and advertising; typing, mimeographing; bookkeeping and office work; dietetics and cooking; first aid and personal hygiene; camping; visual aids. Skills and Techniques (same as above or for preceding period; other skills may be included in this and in the other courses in skills). Language.

For further information write to Director, Post-War Rehabilitation Training, 1798 Scenic Avenue, Berkeley, 4, California.

A UNIVERSITY IN WARTIME.

SOME OBSERVATIONS AND REFLECTIONS ON THE LIFE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD BY THE CHAPLAIN TO THE CONGREGATIONALIST UNDERGRADUATES.

THE most striking changes of the war in University life concern time. They are threefold. First, whereas undergraduates used to have three or four years for study, men (apart from some scientists and the medicals) have now but three or four terms, or even a special course of a mere six months irrespective of terms, and the women but one or two years. Second, during this much shortened residence pre-Service training or other national duties occupy many hours a week, so that lectures and tutorials are held at strange and—to the peace-time Oxonian—unbelievable hours. Third, in spite of the fact that the rarest undergraduate commodity is time, Societies and

meetings multiply. The great political Clubs continue to flourish, and every good cause finds some echo in Oxford, either in the holding of some meeting or the formation of a new Society. Some of these are vigorous enough, others reflect the unfortunate experience of a distinguished Ambassador of a friendly Power who travelled to Oxford and addressed an audience of six!

Educationally it is a relatively simple matter to adjust peace-time curricula to war-time demands: shortened courses and special examinations proportionate to the length of residence are the order of the day. But spiritually such accommodation is unacceptable. Men and women cannot be left to return after the war for most of their spiritual training; they need more, not less, spiritual equipment to face the terrific demands that life in the Services and elsewhere is bound to make.

The religious forces of Oxford (the denominational Societies, the Student Christian Movement, the Student Missionary Union, and the Oxford Inter-Collegiate Christian Union) have no University authority or power. They cannot make time-tables, or demand time: they must fit into the contemporary habits of the undergraduate. They have a twofold aim—to train committed Christians still further in the faith and to reach out to the non-Christians. In peace-time the former task was done largely by a long-term plan of study-groups, and the latter largely (though by no means exclusively) by co-operating with each other and their respective Churches in a triennial mission to the University, so that no undergraduate could leave Oxford without having had the chance to hear and to answer the claims of Jesus Christ.

But when undergraduate life is reduced from three years to three terms or six months such a policy becomes a fearful irrelevance. Yet how can the "faithful" be trained and the non-Christian be reached within six short months? No responsible religious Society could consider adding a whole number of meetings to the already overcrowded undergraduate diary: the necessity and integrity of study is itself a religious concern. We cannot think of asking more time from undergraduates; we may have to ask less: we must therefore concentrate on and intensify the work and the time we already have. A notable example has been set by the Student Christian Movement. Last term (Trinity, 1943) all the work of the Movement centred in a "Faith and Life Week" during which a "Missioner" spoke on three evenings on the Christian Faith, and, with two assistants, held many College meetings and personal interviews. Prayer and study were related to this one piece of evangelism, and such a programme may well become a regular feature of the Oxford S.C.M. in war-time.

Congregationalists in peace-time had a Bible Class before Mansfield Chapel on Sunday mornings, a Congregational Society meeting on alternate Sunday afternoons, and one or two social activities each term. The staff and students, as well as the buildings of Mansfield College, were always a great asset, though Oxford nevertheless sometimes envies Cambridge in this one thing—the possession of a central Congregational Church at which and in which undergraduate activities could centre. Since the war we have frankly accepted the fact that we can count on getting Congregationalists together only on Sundays, and we have tried to fashion our life more after the pattern of an ordinary Congregational Church. We have claimed the four Sundays in each term on which the Congregational Society does not meet for an evening service—not a Free Church University Sermon like the morning Mansfield Chapel, but rather the more intimate and pastoral occasion that Sunday services at home might be. Mansfield College buildings are not open to us during the war; the Chapel cannot be used after black-

out; so all our activities, social, intellectual, and devotional, take place in the semi-basement Common Room of the Mansfield students. And once more the "church" has come to new life in the "catacombs"! We have added to the depth and intimacy of our fellowship at our Society meetings, on social occasions, and, most of all, in our worship.

But time is not the only thing to which we have to readjust ourselves. There is the ever-changing centre of undergraduate interest and opinion. Just before the war we were passing through a phase that might be called "Out with your dogma!"—the intellectual formulation of the faith was the prime concern, particularly as over against false substitutes for it and misrepresentations of it. In one way the war heightened that phase, and in another lessened it. It heightened it because in the first shock of war and in the days when we stood alone and faced invasion, it was easy and natural to ask questions about the ultimate issues of life and death. Mr. C. S. Lewis on "Death" or the Chaplain of Queen's on *"Morituri te salutant"* could draw the largest crowds at S.C.M. teas. The war lessened the phase in that personal relationships and personal conduct came to the fore in a new way: as men and women settled down to the thought of their immediate future in the Services or elsewhere, they wanted to know what Christian standards demanded and what Christian resources are available. Now, as reconstruction becomes the central theme of discussion, political and sociological issues are becoming the chief topic of debate. Last term, in spite of the preparation for the S.C.M. "Faith and Life Week", the largest S.C.M. meeting was a gathering arranged to hear Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr talk on "Marxism and Christianity". And while, as Dr. Niebuhr said, it was strange that Oxford should first ask him to talk about that at the very time that Communism had ceased to be a world factor, it was significant that more Christians and more non-Christians were at that meeting—and were impressed—than at any other. So, while it has been relatively easy to make the necessary temporal adjustments of programme, it is even more difficult in war-time to keep abreast of the swift changes of undergraduate interest and concern.

What is the upshot of it all? Generally speaking, the situation is not unfavourable. The undergraduates in residence are about one half to two-thirds the peace-time number, but St. Mary's is as well filled on Sunday evenings as in peace-time. Similarly Congregationalists are hardly more than one half their peace-time strength, yet the congregations in Mansfield are very little less on the average, and the Congregational Society has a bigger membership than before the war. This does represent a real gain, and it may be significant of the beginnings of a return to religion. If we add to these hopeful signs the further fact of a number of meetings in which political Clubs and religious Societies have co-operated[1], there is reason to believe that not only may the proportion of Christians be growing, but that their influence is extending as well. We can do with such comfort, because it has to be confessed at the same time that the differences between the Christian and the non-Christian are becoming more and more recognized and recognizable—theoretically and practically. It may therefore be wholly in place to ask parents and others responsible to notify the Chaplain at Mansfield College when any Congregationalist comes up to Oxford.

JOHN MARSH.

[1] In connection with Famine Relief, the Persecution of the Jews, Chinese University Life, Changes in Industrial life and organization, *etc.* It is, I believe, a quite new feature of Oxford life that political and religious Societies should hold joint meetings, issue joint manifestos, and pass joint resolutions!

WHY REBUILD
OR
DO OUR CHURCH BUILDINGS REALLY MATTER?

SOME people are very fond of saying, "I can worship God in the open air, on the hills and in the fields, amongst the birds and the flowers, or on the sea shore". I wonder! Do they really worship God much under such conditions? We hear of ten thousand cars on the sands on Sunday afternoons at a certain well-known summer resort. Is there much worshipping of God going on there? Again I wonder! In the *Book of the Chronicles* we are given a wonderful account of the building of the Temple at Jerusalem. What magnificent ideas David had! What splendid materials and workmanship Solomon put into it! What an inspiration this is for all of us to build to the glory of God! I love this saying of David: "Solomon my son is young and tender, and the house that is to be builded for the Lord must be exceeding magnifical, of fame and of glory throughout all countries". The other day I was giving a lecture on "Famous Italian Cities" and I was reminded of the glorious structures raised up to the glory of God. I thought of St. Mark's at Venice, described as "A cavern of gold encrusted with precious stones", of the Campanile at Florence, which Ruskin called "The model and mirror of perfect architecture", of the magnificent Dome of St. Peter's at Rome, which Michelangelo said he would make "larger but not more beautiful" than the Dome of the Cathedral at Florence. St. Paul says, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels". Of course we all know that it is the heavenly treasure which matters most, "the Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God", the message of the good news, which can alter for us the whole of life. But this treasure is in earthen vessels, in our churches and our chapels. If we are fortunate people the vessel helps us to appreciate the treasure. Religious truth comes to us by institutions and habits that we love. Some of us cannot think of God without thinking gratefully of some houses of God, where we have looked for a while "not at the things which are seen and temporal, but at the things which are not seen and eternal".

In this matter I have been extraordinarily fortunate. I think of the old Factory School, as it was called, at Lower Darwen, belonging to my grandfather and my great-uncle, situated opposite the Old Mill, where, as a boy, I attended my first services. These were often taken by students from Lancashire Independent College, foremost amongst them being the Rev. T. H. Darlow, for many years Literary Superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, a great soul, whom I came to know very well in later years. I think of our present beautiful Chapel on Sandy Lane, which I saw built, and where, as a young man, I heard the Gospel preached by one Robert McGee, a man with a message full of power, and later by Charles Davie, its devoted pastor for the long period of thirty-three years. I think of my Preparatory School, St. David's, Reigate, with its little gem of a chapel, perfect in every detail, and of the Headmaster's short informal talks on Sunday mornings on "The Epistle for the Day", which left an indelible impression upon my mind. I think of the lovely Chapel at my Public School, Clifton College, where my young soul was stirred and my young life challenged by many fine addresses, not a few from my revered Headmaster, J. M. Wilson, later Archdeacon of Rochdale and Canon of Worcester, a noble and inspiring personality. I recall the beautiful reredos, a richly-coloured mosaic depicting "the boy Jesus sitting amongst the elders, both hearing them and asking them questions". I think of the Chapel at

King's College, Cambridge, that glorious edifice with its brilliantly-coloured windows, its deep blues and rich reds, and its superb singing, now more widely known through the unique Carol Service on Christmas Eve. At Cambridge, too, I must mention Emmanuel Congregational Chapel, where I used to hear P. T. Forsyth, widely recognized as one of the foremost theologians of his day. Finally, there was our glorious chapel at Gresham's School, Holt, almost every stone of which I saw put in its place, with its richly coloured East window depicting the City of God. Here I often had the joy of giving a message to growing youth. Nor must I forget the deep-toned bell, which I saw cast in the foundry in Whitechapel, inscribed with the words "Ring in the Christ that is to be". All these lovely buildings were erected to the glory of God. What has been their influence upon young and old alike? Incalculable, immeasurable! One cannot possibly exaggerate the importance of these earthen vessels, these repositories of the heavenly treasure, the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. We need them so that we may worship God in spirit and in truth.

Of course a grand building is not necessary. I can remember a quaint little Scotch kirk at Broadford in the Isle of Skye and the simple service in English, followed later by one in Gaelic. The precentor sat directly beneath the minister in the pulpit and gave out each verse of the lovely old paraphrases before we sang it. The true spirit of worship was there. I know a little Methodist Chapel at Seascale in Cumberland, where I heard J. H. Jowett, who was staying there for his holiday, conduct a service during the anxious days which preceded the Battle of the Marne in August, 1914, and I recall the wonderful spiritual atmosphere he created. I remember, too, an upper room in an hotel at the Reider Alp in Switzerland and the gorgeous vision out of the window of snowy peaks glistening in the brilliant sunshine, where I heard a very striking sermon on *John* 1 from Dr. Lock, at that time Warden of Keble College, Oxford. The most beautiful spot in which I have ever worshipped God was, perhaps, the little chapel at the Riffel Alp above Zermatt, in full view of the glorious Matterhorn, the dazzling purity of whose snow was a benediction and a challenge in itself. To this day I remember an eloquent and soul-stirring address by Dean Lefroy, the famous Dean of Norwich, who loved the place and best of all its chapel, in the building of which he had had so great a share. Perhaps the most interesting building in which I have ever worshipped God was a little wooden church in the Australian bush, surrounded by huge eucalyptus trees. We had driven four or five miles from the "station" on which I was staying and, when we arrived, we saw horses tethered all round the wooden fence about the churchyard. God was in that place, too! And, lastly, I think of the City Temple, where, years ago, I heard R. J. Campbell, then at the height of his fame, a tremendous inspiration to a young man. And what is the City Temple today? Four bare walls, a tower, and nothing more! Is it any wonder that I want to see it rebuilt along with all our other damaged churches? "They that wait upon the Lord", says Isaiah, "shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint". And where can we best renew our strength? Surely in God's house in fellowship with our fellowmen. Is not that the reason why we want to rebuild our churches? Yes! our church buildings do really matter.

J. R. Eccles.

RELIGION AND YOUTH IN THE SERVICES.

THE spiritual ministrations of the Chaplain in the Forces have to be directed for the benefit of three classes—the professed Christian man, those who have become slack in the practice of their religion, and that large section whose religious attachment seems to be purely nominal. Towards each class a different approach is needed, and this in some measure creates the chaplain's problem. It is the same problem in a slightly different form which confronts the minister in his pastorate; his message must please both young and old, and his teaching has to satisfy those in varying degrees of spiritual development.

I write as a Congregational Chaplain and therefore with a particular interest in the young Service Free Churchman. We need not assume that the problem of a decline in religious practice amongst Service men is confined to Protestants. A Roman Catholic padre admitted to me that amongst the attested Roman Catholics he has the problem of the non-practising Catholic. Amongst those whose attested religion is "C. of E." the number actually confirmed is probably about one-third. This assessment was made by an Anglican friend of mine who is a Chaplain in the R.A.F. He added that of those who were confirmed, perhaps only a third could be regarded as having a definite connexion with the Church. My own work is concerned with Church of Scotland and English Free Church personnel. During the past two months I have made careful inquiries amongst new arrivals to assess their religious connexions. For this purpose my interviews have covered some three hundred men. Actual Church members represented 30.5 per cent, and definite adherents accounted for 32.5 per cent. The remaining 37 per cent were negative in regard to any church connexions. Apart from Scottish personnel, who would naturally attest themselves as "Church of Scotland", those who declared themselves as Methodists, Baptists, or Congregationalists must have had some connexion in the past with churches of these orders. I must confess that I was surprised and gratified to discover that two-thirds of the personnel under my spiritual care were definitely attached in civilian life to the Christian Church. (The percentage of nominal Free Churchmen would appear to be much lower than of those who are nominally C. of E.) This very fair percentage must in very large measure explain why the compulsory Church Parade Service is a real act of worship in which the men are most reverent, entering wholeheartedly into the singing and attentive to the address.

The Chaplain, like the minister in an ordinary pastorate, is concerned with reclaiming those whose lives remain outside the influence of the Christian Church, but his main task is to minister to Christ's flock. After all, we must seek at all costs to keep for our churches the young men who have come away from them. This is where I have a grave misgiving. After the last war a large percentage of men never took their place again in the Church on their return to civilian life. The danger is that this will happen again. The question is not to apportion blame, but to make every endeavour to avoid this calamity. On one occasion I heard a criticism from a civilian minister that the Chaplains in the Services were not keeping in touch with the young churchmen. I heartily refuted this indictment. For one thing, the overwhelming majority of Chaplains to H.M. Forces are civilian ministers in uniform, and they will return to pastorates after the war. To put it on a very low level, it is to the Chaplains' own interest to preserve the young men for the churches. The fact remains, however, that

the numbers associating themselves with Christian activities, apart from the compulsory Church Parade Service, are lamentably small. There may be a danger in assessing the religious temperature by the counting of heads. Elijah's pessimism blinded him to the fact that there were ten thousand in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal. All the same it would be blind folly to deny that a leakage is already now taking place amongst our young men in the Forces. Perhaps a more definite drive could be made in the home churches amongst young men before they join the Forces. In the light of my experience, I make certain suggestions for what they are worth.

1. An emphasis upon the necessity of the Church and of the personal duty towards it would, if realized, cause the young Christian to seek the Christian fellowship and associate himself with it. Religious fervour and the spiritual life are kept alive by public worship and association with one's fellow Christians. This fact, I feel, is not generally recognized, as comparatively few take advantage of the facilities for this purpose which our chaplains seek to provide. Perhaps the problem is a variant of the one so often apparent in normal church work, where we find that those who were connected with a local church fail to associate themselves with another church on removal to another district. I would define one of our problems as due to a defective teaching in churchmanship.

2. One minor but perhaps significant fact which has forced itself upon my notice both at home and abroad is that in the case of mixed marriages the declared Protestant changes his religion when marrying a Roman Catholic. I have pointed out on more than one occasion that from the technical point of view such a change is not necessary. But the fact that this "change of religion" is undertaken seems to me to be an indication that we have not been sufficiently positive in the exposition of our Protestant principles. There is a danger that by a good-natured toleration we should betray our Protestant heritage. I do not urge anything in the nature of anti-Roman Catholic teaching, but rather for the need of an exposition of the Protestant position which, if understood, would not allow one party to a mixed marriage to feel that a "change of religion" doesn't matter.

3. I seriously question whether our young men are equipped to face the serious tests of faith which they encounter under conditions uncongenial to Christian living which have to be confronted in Service life. No one will affirm that it is easy to stand by Christian convictions amongst a far larger percentage of men whose attitude towards religion is, to say the least, far from positive. There is always the articulate minority who will make it uncomfortable for the man who shows signs of his religious convictions. Church-going is often ridiculed. There is also the menace of the talker who re-echoes the declarations of the rationalist. A young man attending one of my Church members' classes mentioned the discussions in his hut on religion, where there were those who said that religion was incompatible with scientific conclusions; that the Bible was not true because the early chapters of *Genesis* were mythological. He did not know, he said, how to combat such statements. Our young people have not been equipped with answers to such critics or prepared for the stand which they must be prepared to make to be true to their religious convictions. There is need for the training of our young men to take up the cudgels in the defence of Christianity. Have they been equipped to become defenders of the Faith when they hear it attacked? Have they been taught such loyalty to Christ that they may be able "to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand"?

A Congregational Chaplain in the R.A.F.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS

SCOTCH BROTH.

I LIKE Scotch broth. Of course, it is sometimes embarrassing and awkward to manage: its ingredients may burn the tongue or challenge you defiantly or impishly from the spoon. But it is far more exciting—and nourishing—than either the tame *consommé* or the "tomato" or "brown windsor", which, claiming to be homogeneous and straightforward, conceal one knows not what.

It is in its variety that Scotch broth is characteristically Scotch. Highlands and Lowlands, Selkirk and Skye, the land of brown heath and shaggy wood, of mountain and of flood, has always something new to offer. A few notes on a second August spent in Scotland may therefore not be without interest.

One count against Scotland in August must certainly be the weather. Last year in the Trossachs I had few fine days, and could do little climbing. This year I had four fine days in thirty. All five Sundays were wet. Before the end of the month the newspapers were allowed to record the welcome I received: "The equivalent of 24 hours' normal rain fell on Glasgow in half-an-hour on Sunday, August the 1st. It was the heaviest cloudburst recorded in the city for at least twenty years. Roads were flooded and trams held up, and in the surrounding country crops were flattened". That set the tone for the month. On the last Sunday rain fell in torrents in the hour before evening worship; it would not have been surprising to find the congregation consisting only of elders in bathing costumes; but 600 sturdy souls braved the elements.

It was not the depleted congregations, however, which were the greatest concern, but the fact that most of the harvest was still to be gathered in. Much of the corn had been cut, and from the hill-tops thousands of stooks in serried ranks were a fine sight, but they were standing awaiting the sun and a drying wind far too long. On my last day I look down on many miles of them, in vain hoping to discern a sign of labour. But they were far too wet for work to be anything but waste. In places, too, uncut corn had been beaten down; wheat seemed to stand better than oats or barley. There were, of course, many fields which had been safely cleared, and there was always heartening news of good weather, and consequent good harvest, in England, but on the whole farmers in Scotland in August 1943 must have envied the Sassenach!

And, surely, though no doubt the Scotch are too patriotic to admit it, another of Scotland's disabilities is the thistle. Sometimes in a field of corn lashed to the ground by rain the only standing growth would be thistles, jauntily, impertinently challenging all the winds that blow to "come on". Has the thistle any value, I wonder? I believe I have heard it said that cattle eat and enjoy thistles. If that is untrue, the thistle must be a constant menace to agriculture. A picture sticks in my mind of a gaunt old woman with a scythe, with skirts to her feet, limping slowly about a large field, and sweeping down the thistles. When all the energy is released from war tasks, will there be a national campaign for the eradication of the thistle? But perhaps I talk not only treason but nonsense, for I know not a thing about agriculture, and the thistle may have a thousand and one uses.

Far be it from me to suggest that the Scotch language is a drawback, for it is always music to my ears. But I have never before realized there were so many varieties of it, or how strangely it could sound. One afternoon I listened to a friendly woman talking to two Welsh children. But she had to give it up, for not a word could they understand. Sometimes, too, I found myself in the position of the English tourist in France, who marvelled that even children of five spoke French. Often I walked round the bowling greens near my hotel, not so much to watch the game as to listen to the conversation: the Scots I might have understood, the bowling terminology I might have mastered, but the combination of the two was too much for me. I had never known before that the Scotch were so keen on bowls: perhaps it is the game of those who find golf too expensive. But night after night, wet or fine, the same hundred or so men would be at play. Let no one be surprised that I say wet or fine; slippers were used, and play went on through quite heavy rain—perhaps because play would be almost nil if it were limited to fine weather! These men seemed to find in the companionship of the bowling green the fellowship which is supposed to be characteristic of the Church. Did they go to church on Sunday, I wondered? And was the church, their daily work, or their play, the central thing in their lives, or in what proportions were they combined?

I have not included difficulties of transportation among the disadvantages of Scotland, for they are now universal. Trains were crowded, of course, and taxis difficult to get. Queues began to form at 8.30 for the 10 a.m. train from Glasgow to the North, and it was well to buy tickets in advance. Lack of petrol had taken the cars off the roads, and sightseeing was often dependent on buses, which meant much time-wasting in queues. It also nearly ended my career, for near Dunkeld a lorry came round a corner at 40 m.p.h. on the wrong side of the road, and we were lucky to escape with minor injuries to the driver and conductress. Here I must say how pleasant and obliging were the conductresses on many bus services—I refrain from comment on those on the Glasgow trams.

I went to Scotland for an August ministry in Wellington Church. An old U.F. Church, Wellington is splendidly situated near the University. It has a fine congregation, with 1,717 members, 52 elders, 552 members of its Women's Guild, and a church officer who is a great help to the guest preacher. It raises some £8,000 a year, and few churches in Scotland—in the world for that matter—exercise so much influence. During the 150 years of its history only one minister has left it for another sphere, and he for health reasons. Perhaps its minister best known in England was Dr. George H. Morrison, who held the pastorate from 1902 to 1928. Dr. Morrison has left a great name behind him, not only as a preacher, but as a pastor: I have heard it said that he wrote over 200 postcards every week; certainly he seemed to know all that happened in the lives of his people, and at once he wrote to them about events important or unimportant. His successor was the Rev. D. E. Jarvis, who has for fifteen years maintained the work at high level; his sterling services have recently been recognized by the University of St. Andrews, which has conferred on him the D.D. degree.

Last year I had been told that there were certain to be good congregations in the morning, but that the evenings were "chancy". Few churches nowadays can have a morning congregation like Wellington's—professors, schoolmasters, doctors innumerable, lawyers, bankers, business men. Few churches have a congregation which can sing so well—and what splendid tunes there are in the *Church Hymnary* that English

Congregationalism knows nothing about! Last year *Churchman* of the *Evening Citizen*, whose Saturday feature in that paper is one of the finest bits of religious journalism I know, was so generous in his comments that the church was filled in the evenings. Churchman, as everybody in Scotland knows, is Mr. Alexander Gammie, and Wellington has a warm place in his heart, for he wrote Dr. Morrison's biography.

This Sunday evening congregation deserves a word on its own. Many Glasgow churches unite for worship in August; that leaves many ministers free, and there is always a sprinkling of them in the congregation. Many Glasgow pulpits have also guest preachers, and it is to be feared that worshippers do a good deal of "gypsying". The result is that one does not know whether to be gratified at large congregations or not; certainly letters of thanks like one which has just reached me leave mingled feelings:

> "Last August I read in the Press about you, and came out on the remaining Sundays of that visit. . . . I have told many in my own church of the pleasure they would derive from a visit to Wellington".

My own sympathy is always with the minister who is "playing at home", and it is much more gratifying to draw a congregation of outsiders, if it can be done, than to feel listeners should be in their own churches. This year the weather on Sunday evenings no doubt kept some people in their own pews, for which we can be grateful.

Several times during the month I heard that the Church of Scotland was dead! But congregations and worship like that at Wellington are sufficient to give that rumour the lie. And there are many other signs of life. Dr. J. Hutchison Cockburn, the Ex-Moderator, is the Convener of a Committee which is conducting a campaign of evangelism in the Presbytery of Stirling; lessons there learnt will be used in other Presbyteries. True, there are disquieting signs. In too many places there is a spirit of defeatism about Sunday evenings: and too often have I heard sympathetic observers declare that church union, decreasing the churches in a village from two to one and reducing competition, has produced pastoral somnolence. Of Congregationalism in Scotland I shall perhaps speak at another time. But certainly much of Scotland is over-churched; in Perth, for example, there are, I think 16 parish churches, with two Episcopalian and other "lesser breeds". And what changes the years have brought! I called on one "meenister", and found he was "shooting the grouse", while his small son, wearing the dress of an Indian chief, was collecting birds' eggs. Shades of John Knox!

I have left little space to describe some of my week-day activities. The Rev. J. Ernest James, who has taken on a herculean task at Elgin Place, Glasgow, took me one day to see the Scottish National Memorial to David Livingstone at Blantyre, surely one of the finest missionary memorials in the world. I liked the way in which provision had been made in the Memorial grounds for the entertainment of children: many of them will no doubt first feel there the glamour of Livingstone's life and the splendour of his calling. A day or two before our visit a plaque had been unveiled commemorating the services of the Rev. James I. Macnair to the Memorial: Congregationalists are proud that the idea of the Memorial was born in Mr. Macnair's mind, and rejoice that he has been enabled to see it develop so successfully.

I had a week in Edinburgh, working in the New College Library by the courtesy of the Principal and Librarian. Prof. Hugh Watt, whose *Thomas Chalmers and the Disruption* has deservedly been acclaimed on all hands, showed me my way about, and then I was left to myself in the closed

Library. Many of the books had been transferred to the basement for safety, and I had visions, until I mastered the system of manipulating the lights, of being lost in the maze and my body being discovered when the College opened. Prof. Watt came across me there one day, gleefully rejoicing that he had just read in the press that I was "holidaying in the Highlands". At Prof. Watt's home one night I had an unexpected pleasure, for Dr. George Jackson, to whom I, with many others, owe so much, had come to live next door. "East Winderly West Enderly" Edinburgh deserved all that Robert Louis Stevenson used to say about its climate, but Edinburgh is a grand city for all that. I was glad to get some time with Prof. Dover Wilson to talk over Elizabethan matters, and with the Rev. C. T. Rae, now returned to his native Scotland, but I was appalled to find the Royal Mile apparently unchanged since I first saw it thirty years ago. I walked along it one Saturday afternoon, and there were drunken men, slatternly women, uncared-for children in abundance. I humbly suggest to the Churches and to the University of Edinburgh that here is a task at their doors, and that they resolve to spend not a penny on themselves before they have removed this reproach on "the Athens of the North". And, while I am being unpleasant, let me suggest that the Burgesses of the Fair City of Perth secure priority for the importation of 1,000 notices from the United States, reading, "Clean your sidewalk. Curb your dog". The strange thing is that one sees comparatively few dogs: the pavements must be cleaned very rarely—perhaps total reliance is placed upon the rain! This is the greater pity as the city deserves its epithet. There are glorious views along the Tay, and that from Kinnoull Hill is one never to be forgotten. I read Scott's *Fair Maid* during my stay, and learnt that the moderns have little to teach him in the telling of a story.

And I learnt where Scott found his queer characters. Early one morning on a hill-top I found a strong, wild-looking, weirdly-dressed woman. She told me where the best views in Scotland were to be found, and how she had often walked 40 miles a day, and then suddenly launched upon a violent tirade against the medical profession. She told many stories of the callousness and cruelty and ignorance of doctors, and of how they wanted to keep her under observation. Then, with a sudden "But what a queer subject to talk to you about in such a lovely place", she strode away, perhaps back into the Scott novel from which she had come. A younger woman, with an attractive tan, after a remark about the weather in a city street, said she was going "to make the old man his dinner—he's bedridden and I've been waiting on him ten years". She went on to explain that she had nursed her mother, who had cancer in the throat, for nine years—all this to a perfect stranger.

I cannot dwell on many other experiences—lunch with Dr. Hutchison Cockburn at Dunblane to see his grand old cathedral; memorable hours in the Cathedral grounds at Dunkeld; a rainy, oh so rainy, day at St. Andrews, where a woman minister, the Rev. Helen E. Woods, bravely maintains the Congregational witness, and to which the Rev. Frank Y. Leggatt has just retired.

But room must be found for one more reflection. The rain often drove me to the cinema—twice a week for three weeks after 12 months' abstinence. What a contrast, what a challenge, the full cinema presents to the empty churches! How the perfect technique shows up our fumbling! What are the Churches going to do about it? Religious films? Yes, of course. But the Churches have not the resources for the production of films which will stand comparison with the secular film (I use the word "secular" without

prejudice: some films have done far more good than any sermon or any oratorio). Nor can the Churches by their preaching equalize the appeal of the cinema: only the "stars" get on the screen and preaching is done by the ordinary man. The Churches have to do *their* job as well as the film producer and artist do theirs. And their job? Just that of growing good men and women. It is because they have failed here—maybe because they have been trying to do other things—that the Churches count for so little in the world today. It is because we Christians are so little different from non-Christians that the Kingdom tarries.

* * *

Scotch broth? Yes. Palatable on the whole, I trust, but one or two bits that burn, and how shall we tackle the spoonful of unchristian Christians? ALBERT PEEL.

Mr. Rom Landau, we suspect, never needs an excuse to write a book, but that proffered for *Letter to Andrew* (Faber, 8s. 6d.)—to set out the religious way of life to the contemporaries of a young airman who had given his life—is the reverse of pleasing. It is amazing how far Mr. Landau manages to roam in his chapters—free will and suffering, fear and sin, sex (highly coloured), and service. Amid all the luxuriant profusion he has often wise and true things to say; so much so that we are left with the impression that if once he learnt o prune, he could make valuable contributions to our thinking. The description of the bride and groom in the train is an example of his power to write well. He apparently knows nothing of the Free Churches, and has the foreigner's inability to understand Puritanism, though it is delightful to find him writing of "our famous sense of humour" and "our national disease"; he rather gives himself away, however, by thinking we were still playing cricket at the end of September, 1938. Meanwhile it is interesting to note that a 9th impression of Mr. Landau's *God is My Adventure* (Faber, 12s. 6d.) has just appeared.

Not long ago we commended Miss Margaret T. Monro's *Seeking for Trouble. A Book of Unlikely Saints* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.) has the same characteristics—insight, incisiveness, and a lively style. Indeed, the style sometimes deteriorates into colloquialisms: "too intriguing for words", "chuck his weight about", "was clearly nuts", "monkeying with evidence" do not add to the book's effectiveness. Miss Monro's book is clever Roman Catholic propaganda, but the wise reader will not be deterred by this, but will look beyond to some of the deeper questions she raises. She deals with St. Aloysius Gonzaga (1568-1591), St. Rose of Lima (1586-1617), St. Benedict Joseph Labre (1748-83), St. Gemma Galgani (1878-1903), and, a fragment only, St. Thérèse of Lisieux (1873-97). "Many biographers are hacks", Miss Monro tells us. She herself is far from a hack, but it is amazing what so acute a person is prepared to accept. She believes, *e.g.*, that Gemma talked with our Lord, but she commends her for being so docile as to obey spiritual directors who ordered her not to obey our Lord's commands. It does not seem to occur to Miss Monro that there may be significance in the fact that only one of her five "Saints" reached an age of more than 25: is it unreasonable to think this suggests there is something pathological about them? This does not mean that great spiritual influences were not at work in them: once more we have the mystery of stigmata. To the subject of expiation we refer in the Editorial, but the picture of Gemma fiercely wrestling in prayer with Jesus for the salvation of a soul and failing until she secured the intercession of His mother is repellent. The book is easy reading and stimulating to the point of provocation.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS

It [the "dual system"] has caused persistent trouble ever since the State began to assume responsibility for public education, and time and again has wrecked promising schemes of reform. Today, in spite of the accumulated evidence that they are quite unable to provide and maintain schools of a satisfactory standard, the Churches resolutely refuse to surrender their buildings to the State. It is easy to appreciate their concern, that children shall be instructed in the Christian Faith according to their particular tenets, but it is difficult for the impartial observer to reconcile the tender care they manifest for the children's souls with the disregard they exhibit for their bodies..

H. C. DENT, *A New Order in English Education.*

When one goes carefully through all the documents and negotiations upon the subject of reunion of Churches, one cannot escape the impression that an attempt is being made, probably with good and benevolent intentions, to cage and chain the young life of the Indian Church—which is just beginning to pulsate through its body—in the steel frame of a comprehensive and strong hierarchical type of ecclesiastic polity, reflecting the historic evolution and the theology of the Western Churches. Motivated and advocated by Western missionaries, supported by the Indian clergy of their making, and by mission employees piloted by ecclesiastical experts, but thoroughly misunderstood by the large bulk of independent laymen and women, young and old, this movement for reunion has been conducted with undue haste. What scope will there be for the play of Indian genius within such a Church economy?

R. C. DAS, "The Approach to Hinduism" in *World Dominion*, Sept.-Oct., 1943.

The future of a torn world does not depend upon any Pope, who as Vicar of Christ preserves God's revelation and teaches in His name, and who guides and helps the world with the experience of two thousand years of human history behind him; it does not depend upon any Bishop, who, as the successor of the Apostles, also rules and teaches the flock of the fold entrusted to him; it does not depend upon any preacher or teacher or writer who may weave ingenious theories of social and political reform; the future of a torn world depends, under God, upon the apostolic life and example of the Christian as Christian, standing in the market-place, and by his daily habit of life in mind, will, and character seeking, within his own limits and opportunities to complete Christ's own work—a work which the limits of time and space rendered it impossible for the Incarnate God to perform.

MICHAEL DE LA BEDOYERE, *Christianity in the Market-Place.*

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

Queen Elizabeth. By THEODORE MAYNARD. Hollis & Carter. 18s.

We confess it would give us pleasure to take this book chapter by chapter, and show the sad plight into which a biographer falls when his preliminary bias overrules all. This, of course, would not explain Mr. Maynard's spelling—"imposter" and "harrass"—or mistakes like *Lawrence* Andrewes, or misprints like "cutsody". Nor does it help us to understand why Mr. Maynard says that no complete account of the Archpriest controversy has been published when a fellow Roman, Mr. Philip Hughes, devoted considerable attention to it in his *Rome and The Counter-Reformation in England* not so long ago. It must, however, be presumed to account for his description of Mary, Queen of Scots as "an unprotected young girl among men who were as ruthless as wolves" and his belief that Philip II was the protector of Elizabeth, and that his "forebearance [*sic*]" with her was "astonishing". "Catherine de Medici was notoriously inclined to Protestantism", we learn; Cecil, apparently, was engaged in a continual sneer; "the Church . . . had no connexion with the Bartholomew's Day Massacre". Of Drake and Hawkins Mr. Maynard writes:

> I confess that so far from swelling with pride at the thought of their exploits, I am ashamed of them—just as a German who understands the true genius of his people is ashamed of the brigandage of Hitler.

[This opinion, by the way, is not shared by Bishop David Mathew, who begins his *British Seamen* (Collins's "Britain in Pictures" series, 4s. 6d.) with praise of the Elizabethan seadogs. Bishop Mathew has served as a midshipman and is now a Bishop of the Church to which Mr. Maynard belongs, and so the latter had better submit himself to authority!]

Comparison with the present day is a favourite technique of Mr. Maynard, but will it be believed that in trying to excuse the Pope's sanction—through the Cardinal Secretary—of plots to "remove" Elizabeth he can say (the italics are ours)?:

> however much we may disapprove of political assassination, few would in our day be greatly shocked if someone among the people savagely afflicted by him should dispose in this way of Hitler. Elizabeth's was a case of equal extremity—that of *a usurping tyrant maintained in power by terror.*

That is what comes when one starts out from the assumption, stated in the attempt to whitewash the traitors Stanley and York, who went over to the Spaniards, that "the best good which could befall their country was its return to the Catholic Faith". This gives Mr. Maynard the assurance to say that Elizabeth's deathbed is "one of the most dreadful in history. . . . Wild-eyed, desperate, and afraid she went out into the darkness . . . not an insane woman but a lost soul". Where Mr. Maynard got his knowledge

about the "deathbeds in history" or the fate of Elizabeth's soul we are not told.

All this is to be regretted because Mr. Maynard not only writes well, but, on the sides of his subject where he has adequate knowledge, he has sound and shrewd comments to make. And with his ultimate verdict on the Queen we have no quarrel:

> For her success—perhaps the most brilliant and the most continuous enjoyed by any ruler in history—she was equipped equally by her gifts and her defects. The parsimony and the hesitation so often noted in her were not the least of the factors contributing to her eventual triumph, for these were powerful brakes upon her impulsiveness and hot temper. Her scintillating intelligence would hardly have sufficed had she not had a dullard's habit of hard work, the willingness to give attention to details. But above all she succeeded because she was devoid of principle. EDITOR.

The Nature and Destiny of Man. Vol. II. By REINHOLD NIEBUHR. Nisbet. 15s.

This is the second volume of Dr. Niebuhr's Gifford Lecture, and the two together form a really monumental work—one of the most notable contributions to Christian theology in our time. The first volume dealt with man's nature and standing in the sight of God, while the second treats of his destiny, that is, his place in history, his function, and his future. But the book is not, like many Gifford Lectures, a mere excursion into the philosophy of religion. It is a treatise on Biblical theology. It starts with the presuppositions of the Christian revelation. Therefore its appeal is to Christian theologians rather than to outsiders, and one cannot but wonder whether it envisages a gospel which can be preached to the common man. For Christian thinkers, however, it is full of suggestion and opens up many new avenues of thought and inquiry.

The first three chapters of the book contain what may fairly be called a philosophy of history based on the Incarnation and Messiahship of Jesus Christ. He reveals the wisdom and power of God and is for men at once the interpreter and the goal of the historical process. Then follow two chapters on grace mainly as expounded in the teaching and experience of St. Paul. Here, as in other parts of the book, we realize that Dr. Niebuhr's theology is almost exclusively Pauline and by the same token thoroughly Protestant. This appears again in the two chapters which discuss human destiny in the light of the Renaissance and the Reformation, the debate between them being summed up thus:

> The one rightly maintains the moral imperatives of the gospel and wrongly imagines that they can be completely realized: the other rightly understands the limits of historic existence but is wrongly tempted to an antinomianism which allows men "to continue in sin that grace may abound".

Then follow two chapters on what may be called certain practical issues, the first an admirable and timely discussion of toleration, and the second a survey of the struggle for justice in the light of the Kingdom of God. This too is timely and has a very definite bearing on the present world-situation. The book closes with a chapter on the end and meaning of history discussed in relation to New Testament eschatology, on the one hand, and to the rise and fall of cultures and civilizations, on the other.

This brief survey of the contents of the book gives no idea of the height, depth, and range of Dr. Niebuhr's thought. It is, as has been said, a

book for theologians, and the plain man may feel that it makes his religion a very complex and difficult business. Dr. Niebuhr is very conscious that we have fallen upon evil days, and in consequence tends to emphasize too strongly the more sombre and tragic aspects of our human situation. It is true that he also emphasizes the fact that we are saved by grace through faith, though this does not seem to give him that joy and peace in believing, that "simplicity toward Christ", which saved St. Paul from some of the worst consequences of his theology. Like so many moderns, Dr. Niebuhr is more concerned with the Christ of Paulinism and of the Creeds than with the Jesus of the Gospels. He does indeed refer to the teaching of Jesus on Ethics and on Eschatology but never to His teaching about God. God is described as Creator, Sovereign, Judge, Power, Wisdom, and Providence, but never as Father. Yet the Fatherhood of God as Jesus taught and experienced it is surely integral to the Christian Gospel. Difficult though it may be, this new revelation of God in Christ is the one ground of hope for our sinful selves and for an evil world. No theology which ignores or minimizes the sovereign Fatherhood of God can be regarded as adequately representing the mind of Christ. Only as men learn to implement the doctrine "One is your Father and all ye are brethren" can there be any hope for this stricken world. W. B. SELBIE.

Finite and Infinite. A Philosophical Essay. By AUSTIN FARRER. Dacre Press. 20s.

Mr. Farrer's Essay may be described as a sustained attempt to modernize the rational theology of St. Thomas by means of a re-interpretation of its starting-point in the idea of finite substance. The Thomists ask the right questions in the sphere of rational theology, and possess also in their principle of analogy the proper means of answering them. But Thomism is tied up to Aristotelianism, and this limits its usefulness in the modern world. Consequently, Mr. Farrer sets out to relate the Thomist doctrine of God to a different conception of the universe, suitable to present-day needs.

But Mr. Farrer does not begin like St. Thomas with the universe and argue from it up to God. He prefers to take first the relation between God and the universe, supposing God to exist. His purpose is to show what we mean when we say "God"; and to inquire what light a true conception of God casts upon the possibility of proving His existence. God is the Infinite Being, upon Whom all finite being absolutely depends. Finite Being can never provide an adequate proof of God's existence. Nevertheless, all our proofs must start with distinctions which we discern within finite being. Such distinctions, when pressed, amount to contradictions, to overcome which we rise to the conception of God as the *coincidentia oppositorum*. We do the best we can with the analogies that finite being offers us, using one analogy to correct another.

But before we can establish the necessary distinctions we must have a clear idea of finite being. This is where Mr. Farrer definitely departs from St. Thomas. He goes a certain way, indeed, with him in making use of the conception of substance, the worth of which he defends against the attacks of the Logical Positivists. But he modernizes the notion of substance by interpreting it as activity. *Esse* is *operari*. The largest part of *Finite and Infinite* is devoted to the examination of what is here implied. The finite substance or activity that we know best is the Self, the core of which is the will. In the will, then, is the key to finite being. But the will, as we know it in the Self, works within limits. Its primary structure is determined by a physical basis, the perpetuation of which is its funda-

mental aim. But it can and does transcend its physical limitations in striving towards a superstructure of higher purposes. All this, and what it implies for the Self, is worked out with great acuteness and great thoroughness.

But what of the rest of finite being beyond the Self? We only know it by the analogy of the Self. Some finite being—organic being—has a nearer analogy to the Self, so that we have an inkling of its nature. Other finite being—inorganic being—is more remote from the Self, so that we only know it in abstractions. Because of the imperfection of our knowledge of finite being beyond the Self, Mr. Farrer devotes only a limited amount of space to this part of the subject.

Nevertheless, both forms of finite being form a starting-point for the argument up to God. We argue in a general way from the universe as a whole, and in a particular way from the Self. It is at this point that the return is made to St. Thomas. The newer interpretation of finite being does not destroy the distinctions found within it by Thomism. There are still to be discerned in the universe the distinctions between essence and existence, actuality and potentiality, cause and effect, order and chaos: all of which point to their resolution by means of the idea of God as the Absolute Being. So also in the Self there appear the distinctions between the scope of the intellect and the scope of the will, which lead us to argue up to the idea of an Absolute Perfection in which intellect and will are harmonized and satisfied.

Mr. Farrer has written not only a long book, but also a great book. The energy and closeness of the reasoning is remarkable. It is supported by great historical knowledge and by a valuable gift of illustration. The arduousness of the way is beguiled from time to time by admirable strokes of wit. What has been said in this review gives only the barest outline of the argument, the strength of which depends upon the fullness and the exactness with which it is carried out. In his discussions Mr. Farrer avoids no difficulties and is never ambiguous.

The principal objection that is likely to be directed against *Finite and Infinite* is that it pays insufficient attention to the continually advancing claims of modern science for an ever larger place in our *Weltanschauung*. It should not, however, be overlooked that Mr. Farrer has clearly marked out what he understands to be the place of science in a total conception of the universe. It is a study of abstractions, which, however widely it expands, and however useful it may be, can never be a substitute for a metaphysic that asks and attempts to answer the ultimate questions.

Particularly valuable in Mr. Farrer's work is his contention that the metaphysical conception of God is implicit in our religious utterances about Him. The metaphysic is not to be rejected in favour of the doctrine of a Living God known only by revelation. It is simply the drawing out in logical form what is meant when we say "God", and understand what we say. To reject the metaphysical conception of God is simply to take up with something that is not God: in other words, it is to put an idol in His place. It is the place of metaphysics to remind us of the limitations of our anthropomorphisms and so save us from idolatry.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

A Treatise on Knowledge. By A. H. SMITH. Oxford Press. 10s. 6d.

This is a very careful, painstaking, and detailed piece of work on the problem of knowledge. Perhaps the book would have gained in clarity if the author had confined himself to his main discussion, that is, our consciousness of objects, but, as he states on his concluding page, he has

deliberately touched on many associated topics. As it is, sometimes there are difficulties in following the main argument, especially in the concluding section, "Speculations on Knowledge".

He begins with Hume's examination of Berkeley's view that, with reference to the sensible qualities of objects, their *esse* is *percipi*, and he has little difficulty in pointing out the inconsistencies of Hume's own position, especially the ambiguity that runs through the whole treatment of "impressions". Kant's theory of knowledge is treated to a similar searching and critical analysis in the second section of the book. Here Kant's inconsistencies are made plain, especially his treatment of space and time, as in the transcendental Aesthetic. The importance of the second analogy in the Dialectic is clearly recognized. Having gathered some positive and valuable factors from Kant's teachings, especially with reference to space and time and the complex nature of consciousness itself, the author, in the third section of his book, proceeds to his own examination of the problem of our consciousness of objects. He is quite clear as to the independent objectivity both of space and time and sensible objects, and also as to the modification imposed by the complexity of consciousness itself. This is a careful and valuable piece of critical and constructive analysis. One would have wished for a fuller discussion of the modification imposed on our consciousness of sensible objects by the physical, physiological, and probably psychological conditions under which they are apprehended. Also it would have been useful if there had been a fuller discussion of the fact that sense experience is permeated with illusion, and again of the ontological status of *sensa*. Perhaps this will appear in a later book.

I heartily commend the book to serious students of the Cartesian philosophy. There is an adequate index. JOHN SHORT.

The Heritage of Symbolism. By C. M. BOWRA. Macmillan. 15s.

In this book a classical scholar writes with real freshness on modern poetry. His theme is admirably expounded both in the first and last chapters; the remainder deal with five leading poets of the last generation, of whom the oldest, Yeats, was born in 1868 and the youngest, Blok, in 1880. The "symbolism" which these men inherit starts from the conviction that in a drab and material world poetry reveals another world, a world of beauty, austere, mysterious, musical. It gives rise to poems in which the poet's consciousness of this other world can only be satisfactorily conveyed by the use of symbols, and even these are too clear-cut to convey the most essential and most indeterminate elements of the poetic experience; an excellent example is Mr. Bowra's analysis of *La Jeune Parque* (pp. 20-26).

This poetry is an element of our time and we need to know it better. In hard times, as Mr. Bowra says, "the post-Symbolists have had the confidence to assert human values in the face of meaningless circumstance and to rise to a tragic grandeur". We tend to forget that on the mysteries such men have glimpsed and on the melodies they have invented many of our contemporaries still live. The preacher and teacher of today could find no saner guide than this volume, which, apart from its actual subjects, is full of suggestion about poetry and modern life. Its picture of symbolism is all the clearer for being contrasted with poetry still more up-to-date:

> The latest poets have in their realistic rhythms and everyday subjects moved a long way from the older generation which with its religious or oracular view of art cannot but keep an air of aloofness. Once again poetry has had to change her character that she may keep her youth.

The essays on Valery and on Rilke may seem at first sight the most helpful, since they patiently (and most successfully) explain poems usually found hard to understand. The story of Stefan George is well told, and it is a good thing that it should be told in the midst of a war against Germany. His poem, *The Disciple*, has much to say to Christians. Algiers radio recently celebrated a Russian anniversary by a broadcast of Blok's poem, *The Twelve*. The story of that poem (which also is something that a Christian today should know) and of its author, is here told, to my knowledge, for the first time in English. Its picture of Christ, standing, as Mr. Bowra suggests, "for that salvation which is coming to Russia through slaughter", takes on a new meaning for the reader of 1943.

The essay that stays in the mind, whether for the fascination of its subject or by reason of Mr. Bowra's success in interpretation, is the one on Rilke. This poet of death and transformation, who discovered new meanings in simple things and whose life was given up to poetry, is more justly and happily revealed in these few pages than in the long volume noticed in this Journal some months ago (XIX, 261-2). "The spirit transforms what is given to it by the outer world and makes it much more valuable in an inner and spiritual world": Christians believe this in a way, but these poets would show them its truth in another way, and it is, as Mr. Bowra remarks, carried furthest by Rilke. The treatment might have been enriched here by comparison with Kierkegaard, who has stimulated contemporary thought by insisting on the values of the absolute at the same time as holding the conviction, which Rilke passionately held, that "truth lies in subjectivity".

W. G. Moore.

The British Empire, Its Structure and Spirit. By Eric A. Walker. Oxford Press. 12s. 6d.

This slight volume of 250 pages by the Vere Harmsworth Professor of Imperial and Naval History in the University of Cambridge is issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. The title is somewhat misleading seeing that it is not a descriptive and analytical work but a historical survey, beginning at the beginning and ending with a chapter on the "Empire at War, 1939-41". The first 134 pages of the book take the subject to the year 1914. Then there are five chapters covering the remainder of the subject. The reader who is already well-informed in imperial history will find the early chapters interesting, although they contribute nothing new to the interpretation of the subject. The last five chapters constitute a useful synthesis covering a very wide field. If only the whole book had been devoted to this period its value would have been enormously greater. Moreover, the strictly chronological treatment has meant that matters of structure, in very sketchy outline, are too firmly embedded in historical narrative to convey a real impression to anyone ignorant of the subject. The two chapters on "Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated Territories, 1914-1942" and "Ottawa and Colonial Welfare, 1915-1941" are very competently written, and the interaction of a variety of factors—economic, political, racial, and strategic—has been most skilfully shown; and Prof. Walker writes with real authority on South African questions. Tabloid treatment, however, displays its worst weaknesses when applied to the important developments of recent years in India and Burma. One looks in vain for a real analysis of the situation.

The last chapter ends with a sentimental peroration describing "the voices down the years" from King Alfred onwards. The quotations from Magna Carta will come as a shock to any reader who, like the present one,

has been brought up on McKechnie's interpretation of that important document. Up to that point one had wondered why the book was written, at least in its present form. D. G. E. HALL.

SHORTER NOTICES & DESCRIPTIVE LIST

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.*)

The standpoint of Canon G. C. Richards, the author of *Baptism and Confirmation* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), may be gathered from his stigmatization of a statement of Dr. E. F. Scott as "a farrago of unproved assumptions", and his remark that "it is necessary for His Holiness the Pope himself to acknowledge the validity of Baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity when performed by an English Nonconformist, or even a monthly nurse". Dr. Richards gathers together some useful patristic evidence about Baptism and Confirmation and their relation to each other, but his emphasis is constantly on the external and mechanical, so much so that he gives the impression of tithing mint, anise, and cummin.

Perhaps the "Appendix on Establishment" is the most revealing part of *Thy Household the Church* (Dacre Press, 3s. 6d.), a scheme of Church Reform advocated by a Group of Clergy presided over by Canon V. A. Demant. The desire to retain the advantages of Establishment and at the same time possess freedom is once more evident, but the Appendix leaves the impression that if Disestablishment ever comes it will not be at the Church's request. The proposals of reform set out by the different writers have the same flavour—patronage, *e.g.*, should be maintained; nowhere is there any attempt to make the members of the Church fully responsible for the Church's life. Free Churchmen would do well to read the volume. They will learn from it a good deal about the Church of England's organization, government, and discipline, and also how short is the distance its reformers are prepared to travel.

To the Rev. A. T. S. James's most useful book for lay preachers another has been added from the Baptist side—the Rev. G. C. Leader's *The Ministry of the Lay Preacher* (Kingsgate Press, 1s. 6d.). Mr. Leader offers much sound and helpful counsel, though we doubt whether it was the Rev. W. *J.* Fullerton whose sermon he heard and approved.

The Baptists have given some great preachers to the world—Robert Hall, C. H. Spurgeon, Alexander McLaren, among others, and perhaps the greatest of them all was Robert Hall. But was he "recognized *everywhere* as the *greatest* orator of his time and one of the *mightiest* in history"? The abundance of superlatives such as we have italicized is the only criticism we have to offer of the Rev. Graham W. Hughes's readable *Robert Hall* (Carey Press, 2s. 6d.), which gives a clear picture both of the man and of the preacher. Mr. Hughes does well to let us see the intellectual background on which Hall's power rested, and also to show the strength of character best revealed in the long fight against pain. Mr. Hughes does not tell of Hall's retort to the critic who expressed surprise that he had married an uneducated maid-servant, "You can't kiss mind".

Mr. S. Hutchinson Harris's *Auberon Herbert: Crusader for Liberty* (Williams & Norgate, 15s.) would have been greatly improved by compression: often for pages we read of familiar political events or of the political activities of his wife's family without a single mention of his name. Brought up to regard Auberon Herbert as a name ever to be respected because of his insistent belief in liberty and responsibility, we have read the book with

great interest. Active, even restless, Herbert travelled widely, seeking especially the places where conflict raged. He settled nowhere for long, and no party could hold one with his independent outlook. Herbert Spencer was his master, which meant that he was always pulling against the stream; the State he regarded as a bad instrument of progress, enervating men while it pretended to help them, and destroying their faith in themselves. His extreme individualism applied to every part of life—there must be no interference with property, trade, or conscience. He wrote his own life-story in his poem "Morning and Evening":

> In the glory of youth the young man went,
> His heart with pride was stirred;
> "They should yield", he cried, "to the message sent,
> And force of the burning word".
>
> The long years passed and a wearied man
> Crept back to the old home-door:
> "I have spoken my word, and none has heard,
> And the great world rolls as before".

Those who read Mr. C. Ernest Fayle's *Harold Wright* will open with confidence his life of Harold's father, *Charles Wright* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.). Charles Wright was a poor boy who, with the aid of the Working Men's College, made his way until he became head of the firm of Henry Head & Co., and the historian of Lloyd's. To the College and to his profession he gave most of his life, though Liberalism, the Adult School at Sutton, and the Juvenile Court had a share of his interest. Mr. Fayle, who collaborated with him in the *History of Lloyd's*, paints the picture, warts and all, and shows how Wright was handicapped by his brusqueness and by his inability to suffer fools gladly. He was a type of Victorian rationalist and individualist which has now few representatives left.

Quakerism has been very fortunate in its historians and interpreters: Dr. Rufus Jones, W. C. Braithwaite, and A. Neave Brayshaw have done their work well. So much so that we wondered whether there was a place for *The Quakers* (Dakers, 10s. 6d.), the work of Mr. Otto Zarek, an exile from Germany. The book, which is well translated, takes some time to get under way, but it is fresh and readable. Its main weakness is a tendency to over-simplification: of this there are three instances on p. 27: "The victorious general demanded the king's head, and on Jan. 30, 1649, Charles was executed" scarcely represents Cromwell's attitude; the Ironsides are all deemed earnest zealots, despite Mr. Godfrey Davies's recent work; and "There is no room in politics for eternal verities". On p. 102 Schleiermacher is made a century *earlier* than Robert Barclay. But on the whole the sketch is helpful. Mr. Zarek does well to emphasize the debt, often forgotten, English Protestantism owes to Holland.

We find Dr. E. Graham Howe's *The Triumphant Spirit* (Faber, 8s. 6d.) a difficult book to evaluate. That is perhaps because the diagrams he uses to illustrate make no appeal at all to us, but even more because the luxuriance of his style tends to garrulity. Dr. Graham Howe should have been his own physician, for "The constant hæmorrhage of spoken and of written words can hardly serve the health of our united body politic". Had the book been pruned severely, it would have been greatly improved. And that should have been possible to one who can write "Burdens tackled are burdens halved, but burdens shirked are twice as heavy" and outline case-histories in vigorous and simple language. Sometimes, too, the printer adds to the difficulties, for one chapter begins "What is the 'Spriit'?". This

said, it remains that this "study in depression" is worth reading. It puts the teaching of Jesus in the language of modern psychiatry, and is based throughout on "the primacy of spiritual forces". It is concerned not with the individual only, for "throughout [I have used] my study of the individual as an epitome upon which to work for our larger study of society", and thus we have discussions about the peace and planning. Dr. Graham Howe says, "Of course we will make mistakes again". This doesn't mean he is determined to do so, but only that he too uses "will" for "shall".

We owe so much to Canon C. E. Hudson—his three volumes, *The Church and the World,* are always at hand for reference—that it is with regret we confess we cannot quite see what he is getting at in *Nations as Neighbours* (Gollancz, 4s. 6d.), despite the valuable 30 pp. of notes. We hope it wasn't to insist that "The sacraments are in fact, the Gospel in action: Redemption at work", a doctrine both superstitious and dangerous. Perhaps it was to emphasize the much more satisfactory teaching embodied in the words he quotes, "the Natural Law itself, if its implications are worked out and fully subscribed to, can furnish the basis for a plan of world order".

Prof. John Macmurray's two lectures in *Constructive Democracy* (Faber, 2s. 6d.) make a pertinent distinction between *negative* and *positive* democracy. British liberal democracy is negative—it stands for freedom, but not only freedom in cultural life, but also freedom in industry, denying to the government the power to use the economic resources of the community for the benefit of the community. Can the transference be made to positive government, the restriction of economic freedom for the general good while safeguarding political freedom and the liberties therewith associated—of conscience, worship, and speech? Prof. Macmurray, who believes a planned economy to be necessary, discusses the dangers in the period of transference, and shows how they can be avoided.

Mr. Emery Reves's *A Democratic Manifesto* (Cape, 5s.) is a vigorous plea that the democracies should recognize that war must be legalized and democracy rest on force. By all means let there be freedom of speech, but not for speech that undermines democracy. Democracy has allowed its enemies to destroy it under cover of its own principles. Neutrality, independence, sovereignty on the old lines, are all antiquated, and now is the time to replace them, adapting the old principles in the light of recent experience.

It is well that Mr. Lionel Curtis, with his fine spirit, long experience, and wide knowledge, is unceasing in his efforts to convince men that a new approach is needed to solve the problem of the post-war world. He has followed *Decision* and *Action* by **Faith and Works* (Oxford Press, 2s.), in which he argues that, the British Commonwealth as now constituted having failed to prevent the two greatest wars in history, we should frankly acknowledge that the resources of Britain and Northern Ireland are insufficient to maintain the peace of the world. The Atlantic Charter cannot be implemented

> until the task of preventing war, with the functions quite inseparable therefrom, is entrusted to an international government formed by two or more self-governing nations . . . [drawing] its authority direct from the citizens composing those nations [and] entitled to make security a first charge on all the human and material resources of the countries it protects. . . .

Mr. Curtis discusses the allocation of functions between the national and

international governments, and makes out a convincing case, not the less so because it has a Christian foundation.

Mr. John S. Hoyland's *Indian Crisis* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d. & 6s.) is one of those books about India that are all too common just now. Mr. Hoyland sees everything Indian through rose-coloured glasses—the *Gita* is "transcendently important and transcendently beautiful". Such language has not much meaning, but it might be overlooked did Mr. Hoyland not depreciate the British and all their works in corresponding degree: the Cripps Mission was only the last of a series of selfish and ill-considered measures of the "divide and rule" variety. Mr. Hoyland's best chapters are those in which he tells of India's terrible poverty in cities and villages alike. Even here, however, although he describes the rapacity of landlords and moneylenders, much more emphasis is laid on the exploitation of India by British imperialism. If Mr. Hoyland had added to his intimate knowledge and genuine sympathy objective treatment, his plea would have had much more weight. The assumption that all India's problems, political and economic, would settle themselves the day after the British withdrew flies in the face of all the facts.

Mr. Hoyland disturbed us by using a spelling of Jawaharlal other than that we had painfully learnt, but we were relieved to find this is the one used by Mr. Gandhi in *I Ask Every Briton* (Drummond, 2s. 6d.), a collection of speeches and interviews in the months preceding his arrest, and ending with his letter to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. Most of the volume is now familiar to students of the Indian problem in this country. On p. 28 there is a statement we can only call astounding, though no doubt Mr. Gandhi believes it as thoroughly as he believes that India will unite once the British withdraw. He says: "British propaganda is so well organized in America against the Indian cause that the few friends India has there have no chance of being effectively heard". In 1940 we put on record our experience that everywhere we went in America, and especially in Universities and Colleges, it was only the Congress view that received a hearing, while the British allowed their cause to go by default. Indeed, it was not until the Cripps Mission that American eyes began to be opened.

We did not find Mr. John Langdon-Davies's *American Close-Up* (Murray, 2s. 6d.) so helpful as we expected: some of the differences between the American and British ways of life in many spheres are well brought out, but America is too huge and variegated to be photographed in 150 pp. Perhaps the best thing in the sketch is the account of the way in which outraged Nature has taken revenge for her ravished soil. Here, rather than in the more propaganda sections, is to be found Mr. Langdon-Davies's best contribution to Anglo-American understanding.

Archbishop F. J. Spellman of New York is described on the title-page of *The Road to Victory* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.) as "Military Vicar of the Armed Forces of the United States"; in the text this becomes "of the Catholics in the Army and Navy of the United States". It is hard to tell whether the Archbishop is Catholic first or American first; as he believes in "the twinship of patriotism and religion" perhaps he would reply he is both at one and the same and all the time. He argues for "the American way of life", based on freedom, soundly resting on religion.

Dr. G. H. Bourne's *Starvation in Europe* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) presents an appalling picture of the state of things on the continent. Country by country we learn of lack of vitamins, under-nourishment, decreased resistance to disease, starvation, and increased mortality. It also outlines the

task—complex and enormous—which will face the Allied nations in the last months of the war and the first months of the peace:

> the opening of large-scale attacks on Europe is going to cause a precipitate fall on the already seriously inadequate food situation. A military attack therefore which takes a long time to liberate the enslaved peoples of Europe will reduce vast masses of people to acute starvation.

Preparations should be made at once to take over relief feeding from the army when the advance begins. Especially must vitamin supplies be made available and personnel be ready and equipped. . A book which presents a challenge to Christians.

Sir John Marriott has done still another service to students in his *Federalism and the Problem of the Small State* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). Here he outlines various schemes of federation down to those of Clarence Streit and Lionel Curtis, and shows how they are related to the problem of the small State. Sir John's own views—and he is a keen partisan—are never hidden, and they lend spice to his survey.

We are glad that there has been a quick demand for a reprint of Mr. H. C. Dent's forthright **A New Order in English Education* (Univ. of London Press, 3s. 6d.). In his preliminary description of the present state of education Mr. Dent uses shock tactics—why shouldn't the elementary school child have playing fields equal to those at Eton? he asks—and it is to be feared that some readers will not recover in time to ponder the constructive proposals which follow. These include a system of apprenticeship for the community, by which boys and girls up to 18 or 19 have the chance to try their hand at practical work; the raising of the entrance age at the universities by three years, all candidates to have had three years' experience of the workaday world; and adult education, with a sabbatical term for all, and short and long-terms in residential colleges as well as leisure-time training. A provocative sketch all educationalists ought to read. See "Worth Noting".

The Rev. Hugh C. Warner's *Christian Advance* (S.C.M., 2s.) suggests "ideas and plans for local action", with a view to winning people for Christianity. It is encouraging to find a book written on these lines—there are suggestions how to gather groups of men, women, and young people, the subjects it is best to discuss with them, and the questions they are likely to ask.. Mr. Warner seems to us to exaggerate the speed at which the discussion of vital problems of religion and life can be reached, but his ideas will serve as a useful basis. Are there many clergymen, we wonder, who take nine periods a week of religious instruction?

**Youth Club Work* (Pilgrim Press, 3s. 6d.) seems to be Mr. Sid G. Hedges's 61st book. But he keeps it up very well, and this book, full of practical suggestions based on experiments, is one that should be read by all giving themselves to Youth Club work. It forms an admirable appendage to Dr. Brew's work commended in our last Editorial. And even before these words are through the press appears No. 62, *Educational Activities for Youth Clubs* (Pilgrim Press, 1s. 6d.), Part I being "Common Activities", Part II "Programmes and Methods".

Miss Désirée Edwards-Rees's *The Service of Youth Book* (R.E.P.) is strongly recommended by the Headmaster of Uppingham, the Chairman of the Youth Advisory Council. Congregationalists who contribute to it are the Revs. R. G. Martin and J. W. A. Singleton.

For youth we have also Miss J. M. Macdougall Ferguson's *The School Assembly* (R.E.P., 6s.), a volume of Services for Worship for Secondary

and Senior Schools, with an accompanying Pupils' Service Book with the same title (10d., 9d. for quantities over 25).

Independent Press has published two more volumes of children's addresses (2s. each), the Rev. F. H. S. Davis's *Choosing a King*—27 "Story-Sermons"—and the Rev. S. H. Price's *Cathedral Windows*—44 "Talks".

Mrs. Gordon has written a charming, if all too brief, Preface to *The Letters of George S. Gordon, 1902-1942* (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.). Gordon appears first as a full-blown undergraduate, and, like Melchisedek, without parentage. This is all the more intriguing, as later it appears that his uncle was George A. Gordon, of Old South Church, Boston. There is similar parsimony in the Notes and Index. "To R.M. in America", we read. But who is R.M.? The text refers to Mrs. McElroy, and the "Index of Correspondents" to Robert McElroy, but nowhere are we told who the gentleman is. And there is a misprint on p. 52.

The letters themselves—from Oxford, Paris, Leeds, the War, Leeds, and Oxford again—are full of interest. Almost Vice-Chancellor at Leeds, actually Vice-Chancellor at Oxford, Gordon's life was a conflict between "affairs" and "letters" in which, if we judge by the list of his publications, "affairs" won, to the regret of his friends and the impoverishment of posterity. Gordon had some fine work in him, and he did not lack confidence; it is all the more strange that he suffered from what he himself called "literary inhibition". Of his views on deeper matters the letters, apart from one on immortality, tell us little. But they are good letters and they shortened a long train journey. EDITOR.

In the Roman Church Modernism in any form is banned. But its voice cannot be wholly silenced, and faint whispers of it may be heard in *The Bible and the Early History of Mankind*, by Father Humphrey Johnson (Burns & Oates, 4s. 6d.). Fr. Johnson disclaims obscurantism and accepts the scientific view of the origin of man. But he also appears to accept the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, though he admits that it contains two different stories of creation. These he prefers to call A and B rather than use the familiar P and J, because these latter "are associated with the school of criticism which assigns a late date to the Pentateuch". This is quite characteristic. In all that Fr. Johnson has to say about palæontology and prehistoric man he is interesting and open-minded. . But as soon as he comes to the Bible he seems to put on blinkers and sees and says only as much as his Church allows him to do. It is not by such means that problems of Biblical interpretation can be solved.

W. B. SELBIE.

Dr. F. R. Tennant's **The Nature of Belief* (Centenary Press, 5s.) is a very practical discussion of the grounds of belief, and of the value of the reasons men give for their beliefs. Without being too technical the treatment is thorough and takes hold of the real difficulties. The nature of authority as a ground of belief, and the place of religious experience among the grounds for religious beliefs, are dealt with at some length, and with a warning against the subjective element in individual experience. Especially good is the discussion of the part which faith plays in all beliefs; *e.g.*, in science as well as in religion. Those who know Newman's *Grammar of Assent* will be reminded of it by much that Dr. Tennant says; and although Dr. Tennant's illustrations have not the colour of Newman's, he has written clearly, and in a way that keeps one's interest. The book is a first-rate bit of work.

Dr. Elliott-Binns, in his *Divine Providence and Human Destiny* (S.P.C.K., 4s.), writes in the first chapter of "Providence in the Bible", and in the second and third chapters of "Providence in History" and "Co-operation with Providence". The last two chapters are based on lectures given to a School of Clergy at Leicester. The second chapter, perhaps the best of the three, finds reasons for believing that in history there can be traced, if only imperfectly, the hand of Providence. The third chapter has many useful counsels for a pastor's work in these days.

Canon A. E. Baker's *Science, Christianity and Truth* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 6s.) is one of those surveys of science which aim at reconciliation between religion and present day scientific thought. The survey, as far as it goes, is well done, but it is in danger of missing out difficulties which perplex the question; and this, not from any idea of evading a difficulty, but because the narrative must be so compressed. With this single qualification the book is good throughout, and it will be useful to the general reader.

Our Greatest Treasure, published posthumously, and the last work of the Rev. John Kearney (Burns, Oates, 8s. 6d.), has those same gifts of devotional exposition which made his former books so widely known in the Roman Church. The present volume contains a very interesting Memoir of the author by the Rev. Edward Leen.

Mr. T. Christmas Humphreys has contributed to the *Wisdom of the East Series* a volume on *Karma and Rebirth* (Murray, 3s. 6d.). This short study of a doctrine at the heart of much Eastern mysticism gives a fairly-stated explanation of what the doctrine of Karma is and is not; but the exposition seems rather to break away into a modern Theosophy, and to lose itself in speculations; in things that seem like what Paul spoke of as "a vain philosophy".

A. T. S. JAMES.

St. Luke's Story of Jesus by Hope Costley White (S.P.C.K., 5s.) gives parts of the Gospel According to St. Luke in a new form. On the left hand page we have actual passages from the Gospel, and on the right hand page simple explanatory notes. There are black and white illustrations, five reproductions, and cover maps of Palestine and the Mediterranean countries. This book will be useful for the younger classes in schools.

Miss Enid Blyton's books are always great favourites with children, and her new work, *The Children's Life of Christ* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.), will be no exception. The story of Jesus is told with a simplicity and reality that will appeal to children of all ages. Miss Blyton has had to omit some parables and miracles, but she is to be congratulated on her selection.

Mr. W. Burman's *Talk plus Chalk* (Capsey, 3s. 6d.) is a Handbook for Teachers, and aims at showing that anyone of average ability can use a blackboard and chalk in the training of children. Many stories suitable for Sunday Schools are given, each with useful and appropriate illustrations.

In her Introduction to *Scenes from the Old Testament* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) Miss Margaret Steppat implies that these dramatized stories from the Old Testament are intended to be acted by children of twelve years old and under. The dramatization has been well done, but is more suited to older children. The book contains scenes from the stories of Joseph, Moses, David, Solomon, Ruth, Nehemiah, and Esther.

MARGARET PEEL.

Despite the somewhat ferocious appearance of the printed page, Mr. Richard Hall's *Toccata, Intermezzo and Fugue for Organ* (Hinrichsen

Edition, 3s.) is not so difficult to play, once the notes are learnt, as it appears at first sight. It is well written for the organ and logically constructed, and though it strongly suggests the influence of Karg-Elert in its use of chromatic harmonies and the layout of some of the passage work, it is well worth a hearing; organists with a taste for the adventurous should try their hand at it.

This most beautiful work of Haydn—*The "Emperor" Variations* (Hinrichsen Ed., 2s. 6d.)—is so rarely played in its original version for string quartet that an organ arrangement of it, bringing it to the notice of a wider public, seems fully justified. The first of Haydn's variations has here been omitted by Mr. A. V. Butcher, and perhaps it is more suited to strings than the keyboard; but the theme and the remaining three variations (from which the hymn-tune known to most people as "Austria" has been taken) well bear their transference to another medium. The arrangement calls for a well-equipped organ; though not difficult, it requires the utmost nicety of rhythm and phrasing in performance.

Mr. S. de B. Taylor's *Suite* of Purcell's *Four Pieces from "King Arthur"*, arranged for organ (Hinrichsen Ed., 3s.), is in Purcell's very direct and straightforward vein, and the occasional astringency of harmony is very characteristic of the composer. The music is quite easy to play, and the arrangement has been well done for the most part; but we are rather uneasy about some of the harmonies in No. 3 ("Fairest Isle"), which in many places differ considerably from the accepted versions; and certainly Purcell did not write the consecutive octaves and fifths that here appear on page 7.

The Rev. W. Charter Piggott's expressive poem, "For those we love within the veil", has been well set to a simple, broad tune by H. Watkins Shaw (Hinrichsen Ed., 3d.). For Saints' Days, Armistice and memorial occasions it strikes quite the right note, and is a useful addition to the rather limited repertory of such hymns.

ERIC H. THIMAN.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

Principal W. A. L. Elmslie's broadcast talks, *Five Great Subjects* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.)—Christ Today, What do we mean by "God"?, Worship, The Choice of Good or Evil, and Facing Death—are very good, so much so that we wonder why he, the B.B.C., or the S.C.M. thought it necessary to get Miss Dorothy Sayers to commend them. *The Christian Church—Yesterday and Tomorrow* (Union of Modern Free Churchmen, 6d.) contains papers by Canon Major ("Churchianity and Christianity") and the Rev. T. Wigley ("The Churches: Their Function and Future"). Canon Major finds in ecclesiasticism, clericalism, sacramentalism, and dogmatism the four marks of Churchianity and the four enemies of the Church. It is not often that a non-Quaker is invited to give the Swarthmore Lecture, but the Rev. Leyton Richards's *Planning for Freedom* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.) would no doubt make Friends feel that the departure from custom had been amply justified. Mr. Richards covers a great deal of ground in his survey, and drives home his argument by apt quotations. We are surprised to learn that Barrow and Greenwood were "committed to the flames at Smithfield"; we had always understood that they were hanged at Tyburn. *The Prophet of the Absolute* (U.S.C.L., 1s. 3d.), which comes to us from India, is an interpretation of Kierkegaard by our contributor, the Rev. H. V. Martin.

ALSO RECEIVED.

BERTHA C. KRALL. *Stories Jesus Heard.* R.E.P. 3s. O.T. stories for young children, with "something to do" at the end of each.

DOROTHY UNA RATCLIFFE. *Mrs. Buffey in Wartime.* Nelson. 5s. Fifteen more stories of the homely dame from the Yorkshire Dales.

RONALD SELBY WRIGHT. *The Average Man.* Longmans. 2s. 6d. Broadcast Addresses by "The Radio Padre".

H. S. STILLWELL. *Wages and Overtime Calculator.* Warne. 6s.

H. A. EVAN HOPKINS. *Henceforth.* Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 1s. 6d.

BERNARD CLEMENTS. *The Church, Peter, and Good Friday.* S.C.M. 2s. Broadcast Addresses.

ARCHIBALD MACFADYEN. *Vignettes of Victory.* Williams & Norgate. 5s. & 3s. 6d.

ROBERT S. W. POLLARD. *Freedom is in Peril.* Friends' Peace Committee. 4d. No, not so much from the Nazis as from 18B.

ADAM PHILIP. *Helping Together.* Edinburgh. Henderson. 1s. A Book of Hints on Life and Worship for Ministers and People.

A. T. HOUGHTON. *God Wills It.* I.F.E.U. 4d. The Bible Background of Missions Overseas.

A. RENDLE SHORT. *The Christian and the Scientific Outlook.* I.F.E.U. 3d.

Speeches and Documents in American History. Vol. III. Oxford Press. 3s. This volume of selections by Mr. Robert Birley covers the years 1865 to 1913.

CECIL NORTHCOTT. *One Hundred and Fifty Years of Christian Missions.* Livingstone Press. 4d.

Earthquake. Three Stories in the "World Adventure Series". Livingstone Press. 1s.

G. M. PARSONS. *Christian Modesty.* Loughborough. Echo Press. 9d. Reprint of an Anglican Vicar's sermon against "Hatless Women".

A. GITS. *The Convert's Catechism.* Burns Oates. 1s. 3d. Protestants would do well to study this catechism and its "simple notes for beginners".

JOHN WALTON. *Makers of the U.S.A.* Oxford Press. 1s. 6d. & 1s. 3d. Short biographies, of Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Lee.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

London Quarterly and Holborn (April). Dr. C. J. Wright concludes "The War and Human History" with a telling experience from Munich time. The Rev. F. B. Harvey writes on Virgil, the Rev. H. S. Darby on Gerard Manley Hopkins, and the Rev. W. Bardsley Brash on "Tolstoy's *War and Peace*". The Rev. Frank Baker has a very interesting "Study of John Wesley's Readings", which is concluded in the July issue. This also contains an article by Mr. Harry Belshaw on Wesley's Influence on Dr. Johnson's Religion, an account of James Smetham by Dr. A. L. Drummond, "An Eirenicon on The Holy Communion" by the late F. C. Spurr, and a study of Wyclif's *N.T.* by Dr. Henry Bett.

Hibbert Journal (July). First among the articles we should put Mr. J. A. Walker's tribute to Maud Petre, with Dr. G. F. Barbour's "Security as a Personal and Social Ideal" a good second. Dr. Erich Meissner argues that today the living centre of the Church is to be found in Germany, Mr. George Harrison describes the *Amitiés Spirituelles* Movement in France, and Dr. Mellone surveys recent philosophical and theological literature.

Baptist Quarterly (July & Oct., 1942). This journal gallantly plods along, dropping farther into the rear; on June 21st, 1943, we received this telescoped issue—and an interesting one it is, the historical and general articles being skilfully mixed. Among the more important are the Rev. E. A. Payne's "1792 and the Ministry Today" and the Rev. G. Dennis Lant's "The Cultivation of the Spiritual Life". A good deal has happened and a good deal has been written and learnt since the Rev. F. C. Bryan wrote his "Religion and Russia".

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Seventh Month). "From the House of the Four Winds" deals with Beatrice Potter. There are five interesting contributions under "By High Road and Country Lane", and five articles on the education of German youth after the war.

Church Quarterly Review (July). Dr. C. J. Cadoux's reply to the Bishop of Gloucester's strictures on *The Historic Mission of Jesus* should—but will not—render Dr. Headlam speechless! Dr. C. S. Carter's "The Real Matthew Parker" shows the deficiencies of Mrs. Perry's recent book. There is an interesting account of Prison Chaplains a Hundred Years Ago.

Evangelical Quarterly (July). The Rev. H. P. V. Nunn discusses recent criticism of *John*, Prof. A. Ross *Hebrews*, the Rev. P. E. Hughes "The Value of Josephus as a Historical Source", Dr. G. D. Henderson the Tercentenary of the Solemn League and Covenant, the Rev. E. F. Kevan "The Re-emergence of Calvinism", and Mr. D. Dewar Dr. Julian Huxley's views on evolution.

Expository Times (July-Sept.). Congregational contributors are the Revs. Godfrey E. Phillips ("Adventism True and False") and H. V. Martin ("Kierkegaard's Category of Repetition"). Dr. Lofthouse on Anthroposophy, the Rev. J. R. Coates on British Israel, and the Rev. C. K. Barrett on "Q" should also be read.

International Review of Missions (July). A useful number, in which the review section is not the least important. Dr. Nicol Macnicol asks "Is There a General Revelation?", the Editor writes on "Christian Voices in India", and Mr. J. Merle Davis on "Principles of Missions in a New Age". There are three more articles on "The Aborigines of Australia".

World Dominion (July-August). Dr. E. L. Allen's story of North Africa—"Christendom's Lost Province"—offers food for thought, and the Rev. T. Warren's account of war conditions in the same field is harrowing. "Aircraftman" says "The Churches Must Be Ready", and Mr. A. S. McNairn has a searching article on "Freedom as Interpreted by Rome". (Sept.-Oct.). The outstanding article is the Rev. T. Cullen Young's study of the Colonial problem.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (June). Dr. J. Q. Adams, the Director of the Folger Library, describes a possible new signature of Shakespeare. Prof. Charlton writes on "Browning as Poet of Religion", Dr. T. W. Manson surveys the available materials for a life of Jesus, and Dr. Edward Robertson "The Riddle of the Torah".

Anglican Theological Review (April). Dr. T. O. Wedel's "Fundamental Catholicism: An Open Letter to an Anglo-Catholic" and Dr. H. H. Gowen's "The Difficulty with Democracy" are searching contributions. The Rev. R. M. Grant is making his way as a *N.T.* scholar. The book reviews are useful. July, to hand just as we go to press, contains a study of Dr. Temple by Prof. John C. Bennett, Prof. A. N. Wilder's "Don Quixote in the American Scene", and Prof. C. C. McCown's "Aramaic and Greek Gospels".

Harvard Theological Review (April). Mr. W. C. Bark writes on "John Maxentius and the *Collectio Palatina*" and Canon R. D. Richardson discusses "The Doctrine of the Trinity". In "The Biblical Quotations in *Matthew*" the Rev. S. E. Johnson examines Torrey's theory, and in "Jewish Mysticism" Dr. Rufus M. Jones discusses Scholem's recent work on the subject.

Religion and Life (Summer). If the review section were as good as the articles this journal would be the best of its kind in two countries. In this issue Dr. R. H. Bainton writes on "The Churches Shift on War" and Dr. Samuel M. Cavert on "Rethinking the Social Function of the Church". Two good articles deal with preaching—Dr. Erdman Harris's contrast of H. E. Fosdick and Reinhold Niebuhr and Dr. J. R. P. Sclater's' "Preaching and Prophesying". An English contribution is Mr. C. S. Lewis's "The Poison of Subjectivism".

The Review of Religion (May). Over 50 pp. of book reviews, some of them admirable pieces of work. The articles are Mr. Eric Werner's "Notes on the Attitude of the Early Church Fathers towards Hebrew Psalmody", Prof. Gladys A. Reichard's "Human Nature as conceived by the Navajo Indians", and Prof. E. M. Manasse's "Conversion and Liberation".

Review and Expositor (July). An interesting issue. Dr. Buttrick's study of preaching in "Power—and the Man" is apt, and Dr. J. M. Trimmer's "Living Endowment" shows the danger to education—and ministerial education—in war-time America. Mr. G. G. Grubbs's "Myles Coverdale: Poet and Song Writer" is welcome.

The Yale Review (Summer). It is good to see this Review again. How sumptuous these American journals seem in contrast with ours! Mr. W. H. Chamberlin, of the *Christian Science Monitor*, opens with a fine study of "Coalition in War and Peace". Mr. H. A. DeWeerd's "De Gaulle as a Soldier" is a good summary, and "Strike Up a Stirring Music" a skilful picture of what war means to two people. M. Jacques Maritain gives us a chapter from a forthcoming book, and M. Jean Hélion a vivid account of "Ten Frenchmen on a Prison Farm". These are but some of a series of notable articles.